DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 196 981 UD 021 012

AUTHOR Sillitoe, Ken
TITLE Ethnic Origins 2: An Experiment in the Use of a Direct Question About Ethnicity, for the Census. Occasional Paper 9.
INSTITUTION Office of Population Censuses and Surveys, London (England).
REPORT NO ISBN-0-906197-06-6
PUB DATE Jun 78
NOTE 84p.: Not available in paper copy due to institution's restriction. For related documents see UD 020 984, UD 021 011, and ED 179 614.

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Census Figures; *Ethnic Groups; *Ethnicity; Foreign Countries; *Questioning Techniques; *Questionnaires; *Research Problems
IDENTIFIERS *Great Britain

ABSTRACT

This is a report on the second effort to formulate an effective question for determining the ethnicity of respondents to Great Britain's 1981 census. Problems encountered in the first pilot test and the two alternate survey forms tried in the second test are described. Included in the present version are additional questions on education, employment, language spoken at home, car ownership, and household accommodations. The response to the survey, which included 2,000 households, is reviewed and the effectiveness and error in response are discussed for individual questions. Also discussed are questions that respondents did not like. Appended to the report are a description of sampling procedures and field methodology and copies of both forms used in the survey. (GC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

OFFICE OF POPULATION CENSUSES AND SURVEYS
SS 1074

SEP 1 7 1980

ED196981

Ethnic Origins 2

An experiment in the use of a direct question about ethnicity, for the census

Ken Sillitoe
Social Survey Division, OPCS

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Occasional Paper 9

UD021012

Price 80p

© Crown copyright 1978

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
M D. Lee
Office of Population Censuses
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

© Crown copyright 1978
First issued August 1977
Published as Occasional Paper No 9 June 1978

ISBN 0 906197 06 6

C O N T E N T S

		Page
List of Tables		1
Section 1	- Introduction	2
2	- General response to the survey	6
3	- Quality of the answers	10
4	- Response to question of language(s) normally used within the household	22
5	- Reasons for errors, omissions and difficulties	26
6	- Questions that were disliked	32
7	- Conclusions and recommendations	37
Appendix I	- New versions of the ethnicity question proposed for use in the next round of fieldwork	42
II	- How the sample was selected	44
III	- Fieldwork Report	45
IV	- Interviewers' Instructions	48
V	- Forms and leaflets used in the survey	54

LIST OF TABLES

		Page
Table 1 -	Non-contacts and refusals - by ethnic composition of household	7
Table 2 -	Reasons for refusals - by ethnic composition of household	8
Table 3 -	Quality of answers - by question type	11
Table 4 -	Quality and accuracy of answers to ethnicity question - by immigrant generation and ethnic origin	12
Table 5 -	How the ethnicity of Greeks was recorded	15
Table 6 -	How the ethnicity of Turks was recorded	15
Table 7 -	The recording of MIXED racial or ethnic descent - by type of schedule	17
Table 8 -	Check on accuracy of own country of birth: as entered by form-filler	20
Table 9 -	Language(s) said to be normally used in the household - by ethnic composition of the household and type of schedule	23
Table 10 -	Number of questions which caused difficulty to form-fillers: by ethnic composition of the household	27
Table 11 -	Reasons for errors, omissions and difficulties - by ethnic composition of the household	29
Table 12 -	Form-fillers who said they found NATIONALITY question difficult - by ethnic composition of the household	31
Table 13 -	Questions form-fillers disliked answering - by ethnic composition of the household	33
Table 14 -	Summary of objections to ethnicity question made at all stages of the survey - by ethnic composition of the household	34
Table 15 -	Form-fillers preferred type of ethnicity question - by ethnic composition of the household	35

SECTION ONE

Introduction

This is the second report on our trials of a direct question about race or ethnic origins, for possible use in the 1981 Census. In our previous report[1] we explained why it was necessary now to try to seek out an alternative way of asking people about their ethnic backgrounds, to replace the questions about parents' birthplaces used for this purpose in the last census. We demonstrated how inferring ethnicity from parents' birthplace data suffered from certain inherent limitations which would increasingly reduce the reliability of this method in the future[2].

We aimed initially at a form of classification that in its crudest form would enable the general population to be distinguished by colour, but that would also allow for the separation of the "coloured" segment into its principal ethnic components. This was necessary in order to render the question acceptable to the ethnic minorities themselves. It also had the advantage that for demographic, sociological and social policy purposes it would permit census data to be made available separately for each of the main ethnic minorities, whose life-styles and needs often differed in important respects. Thus, the form of the question used in the first field test was as follows:-

RACE or ETHNIC ORIGIN

Please tick the appropriate box

(TICK ONE ONLY)

If the person is of a race or ethnic origin other than one of those listed, or is of MIXED DESCENT, please tick the appropriate box and also enter details in the space provided.

- ☐ White {European descent
- ☐ West Indian
- ☐ Indian, Pakistani or Bangladeshi
- ☐ West African
- ☐ Arab
- ☐ Chinese
- ☐ Any other race or ethnic origin (Please describe below)

. . . . . .

- ☐ If of MIXED DESCENT (Please describe below)

. . . . . .

---

1 Ethnic Origins ? (An experiment in the use of a direct question about ethnic origins,). October 1975. SS 1074

2 ibid pp 35 - 43

The results of our first field tests (for full details of which see our earlier report) demonstrated, however, that although the principles underlying our initial design proved to be sound, there were a number of technical difficulties that remained to be solved. The main problems we encountered for which we needed to seek a solution can be summarised as follows:

(i) Immigrants (and their descendents) from the Indian Sub-Continent often said or implied that merely to record that they originated in the Sub-Continent was insufficient. Many wished also to record their religion and/or nation of origin.

(ii) It proved more difficult to obtain the co-operation of persons of West Indian descent and in particular, West Indian parents often felt that their children who were born in this country should be classified as "Europeans".

(iii) Persons of mixed racial or ethnic descent, although very co-operative, often left the question blank because of being uncertain now to record their ancestry.

(iv) Indigenous Whites sometimes thought the question did not apply to them and consequently left it unanswered.

In order to try to resolve these difficulties it was agreed that in the next test we should experiment with two alternative designs of question, which were to incorporate the following features:

VERSION A	VERSION B
(i) To have separate boxes for persons originating from - India, Pakistan, Bangladesh	(i) To have separate boxes for persons originating from the Indian Sub-Continent, to show only if they were - Hindu, Sikh, or Muslim
(ii) With an instruction to the form-filler that if a person was of mixed racial or ethnic descent, all the boxes that were applicable should be ticked	(ii) With a <u>separate box</u> for persons of mixed racial or ethnic descent - but without a request for actual ancestry to be described.

In addition, on both forms a question on nationality was included, to come immediately before the one on ethnicity. This was partly to ascertain if giving West Indians an opportunity to record a person's nationality (as well as ethnicity) would help resolve parents' doubts about the status of their UK-born children. We also wished to investigate what other effects its inclusion might have on response to the ethnicity question, because it was most likely that it would be necessary to ask about nationality in the 1981 Census, in any case, in order to satisfy EEC requirements. Two variants of the question were tested. One asked if the person was a "Citizen of the UK" or of "Any other nationality". In the alternative version the form-filler had to record if each person was "British" or of"Any other nationality".

It was also decided to introduce additional questions on education, employment, languages spoken at home, car ownership and household accommodation. This was to serve the dual purpose of making the content of the schedule more like that of a census form, and also to assist with other work currently being done on designing the main questionnaire for the next Census. The latter aim was further served by taking advantage of our having two versions of the form, to test out alternative formats for the questions on education and country of birth[1].

Otherwise the general design of the second field trial was similar to the first. A self-completion form was delivered to each household by an interviewer. At the same time, an appointment was made for her to return to collect the completed form and to interview the person who had filled it in, to discuss any difficulties he or she might have encountered and any questions that were disliked. The interviewer was instructed to record her personal observations as to the ethnicity of the informant (and any other household members, if present) and if her judgement of the person's ethnicity was inconsistent with the answer recorded on the self-completion form, to check the information with the informant. This time, however, we placed less stress in the explanation printed on the front of the form, on the fact that the questionnaire contained a question about ethnicity. We also instructed our interviewers to introduce the survey as being simply a test of possible questions on a variety of topics, for use in the next Census. This was because the new forms contained questions on a wider range of things than

---

1 See Appendix V for copies of the questionnaires and other documents used in the second field trial.

previously and also because the results from our first trial led us to conclude that to draw especial attention to the ethnicity question was possibly counter-productive[1].

A much larger sample of some 2000 households was selected; compared with 450 on the previous field test. Full details of how the sample was composed and selected are given in Appendix II. The main differences to last time are three-fold. First, our much larger sample of immigrants from the Indian Sub-Continent was structured so that we had equivalent representation of the three main religious communities, as well as a large contingent of East African Asians. Second, we included this time a separate sample of Africans. Thirdly, because of the uncertainty about how to designate themselves displayed by our meagre sample of Greek and Turkish Cypriots in the first field test, we augmented their numbers considerably this time, in order to be able to study their difficulties more closely.

It needs to be emphasised, as in our last report, that although our sample on this second occasion was much larger, it was again not technically possible to select it by the conventional random sampling methods normally used to try to ensure representativeness. Bearing in mind that the purpose of the study is not to collect data purporting to be representative of the groups concerned, but simply to test the effectiveness of alternative designs of question, we consider this technical limitation to be of less importance than it would be in a normal survey.

Both stages of the study were designed by Ken Sillitoe, the author of the report. The appendix on "Sampling Methods" was written by Ann Wharton. Norah Blackshaw again supervised the fieldwork and contributed the "Fieldwork Report" at Appendix III.

1 See Ethnic Origins? , page 24

SECTION TWO

General response to the survey

A summary of the rates of effective interviews, non-contacts and refusals is given in Table 1. Comparison with the corresponding table in our report on the first field test shows that the proportion who both filled-in the self-completion form and were interviewed rose from 70% to 74%, but the refusal rate also increased from 6% to 10%, overall. Non-contacts were lower on the second test, but this has no significance because it results only from our having used an address sample the second time, instead of a named household sample. Thus, losses resulting from address changes were avoided on the second occasion.

It is to be expected on a survey of this type where each informant has to complete a questionnaire himself, as well as be interviewed, that co-operation from the public is likely to be lower than usual. Moreover, in the second field test the questionnaire which had to be self-completed was much longer. This is probably the main reason there was an increase in refusals for all categories of informant. Even amongst the ever co-operative Asians, refusals rose from 1% to 3% ! West Indians were the most likely to refuse, as was the case last time; but the difference between their rate of refusals and that of other groups (apart from the Asians) was relatively less than before. Our original field returns had suggested that West Indian co-operation was much lower this time, but a detailed examination of each case has later shown that households that were hard to contact or from whom it had proved difficult to retrieve self-completion forms had also often been classified as "refusals" by our field staff. This illustrates how problematic it is to determine when elusiveness becomes equivalent to refusing, and reinforces the point made in our earlier report that some of the households classified for instance as "householder seen but interviewer was unable to collect the self-completion form, despite repeated calls", may also conceal a few who were being deliberately evasive.

The reasons given for refusals are summarised in Table 2. Comparison with the corresponding table relating to the first field test, in our earlier report, is of dubious value because of the small numbers we had to deal with last time. However, for what it is worth, we find this time there was a

Table No.1

Non-contacts and refusals - by ethnic compositon of household

OUTCOME (S/C = Self-completion form)	Total	ETHNIC COMPOSITION OF HOUSEHOLD: Indigenous White	Immigrant White	West Indian	Sikh	Hindu	Muslim	African + Turkish + Mixed	Could not be determined
	%	%	%	%	%			%	(No.)
Filled-in S/C and interviewed	74	81	65	67	84			64	-
No hsehold at address	4	1	1	4	5			4	(2)
Hse derelict/demolished	1	-	1	*	2			2	-
Unable to contact hsehld, despite repeated calls	3	4	3	3	2			5	(8)
Hsehldr seen but intvr unable to collect S/C despite repeated calls	3	-	5	5	1			6	(2)
Unable to fill-in S/C because of extreme age, illness or holidays	1	*	2	*	*			*	(1)
Unable to fill-in S/C due to language dificulties	2	-	4	*	1			3	(1)
Filled-in S/C but not available for interview	2	*	3	2	1			3	-
REFUSED to fill-in S/C	10	13	16	18	3			12	-
BASE (Total households)	(2044)	(228)	(345)	(234)	(879)			(324)	(14)

Table No 2 Reasons for refusals - by ethnic composition of household

REASON FOR REFUSAL TO COMPLETE FORM	ETHNIC COMPOSITION OF HOUSEHOLD: Indigenous White	Immigrant White	West Indian	Hindu Sikh + Muslim	Turkish (African + Cypriot + Mixed)	TOTAL
	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	
Too busy or not interested	5	27	8	12	14	33%
Too personal (no partic. qns cited)	7	8	6	-	3	12%
General dislike of forms & surveys	8	2	4	3	4	11%
Would only do it if compulsory	-	7	4	6	3	10%
Did not understand the form	1	2	3	-	1	4%
OBJECTED TO QUESTION ABOUT -						
Ethnic origins	1	4	7	3	6	11%
Amenities	-	2	2	-	2	3%
Employment	-	1	2	1	1	2%
Marital status	-	-	-	-	3	2%
Car ownership	-	-	2	-	2	2%
Number of rooms	-	-	3	-	-	2%
Education	-	2	-	1	-	2%
Tenure	-	-	1	-	1	1%
Cty. of birth	-	-	1	-	-	1%
Languages	-	1	-	-	-	1%
OTHER objections	3	-	15	7	4	15%
Reason for refusal not stated/unclear	4	4	2	2	5	8%
TOTAL HOUSEHOLDS REFUSING	29	55	45	30	39	(199)

large shift toward giving very general reasons, rather than citing a dislike of particular questions. Although interviewers were instructed to try to ascertain if there were any particular questions that had aroused dislike, in the second test only about 1 in 4 of the informants mentioned specific questions in the schedule amongst the reasons they refused to complete the form; as against about a half last time. This would be consistent, of course, with our having introduced a much longer questionnaire for self-completion on the second occasion: leading people to complain they were "too busy", "disliked forms" or "would only do it if it were compulsory"; all of which were reasons that were given much more often in the later field test.

Where mention was made to particular questions, it was the one relating to race or ethnic origins that was cited most frequently - but still by only 1 in 10 of the persons who refused, or 1% of the original set sample. In the previous field test 1 in 4 of those who refused had mentioned the ethnicity question. A similar proportion of refusals in the last test were said to be because people took exception to the questions about household tenure and amenities; whereas this time the numbers were negligible; which would also appear to confirm that the more frequent objections for this reason on the previous field test, were attributable to our having included in the sample a number of people who had shortly before taken part in a (highly unpopular) local authority housing survey.

SECTION THREE

Quality of the answers

Table 3 (overleaf) compares how well each question in the schedule was answered and can be contrasted with the similarly numbered table in our previous report. As before, the questions are arranged according to how well each was answered, with the least successful at the top. It should be noted that except for the ethnicity and country of birth questions we did not endeavour to obtain an independent check on the factual accuracy of the answers and consequently they are classified in this table only in terms of how clearly the answers were recorded: no account is taken of whether they are true.

Evidence collected in the course of the follow-up interview, when informants were asked about the difficulties they had completing the form, suggests that for instance in the Employment and Nationality questions there may be a fair proportion of untrue or only partially true answers, amongst those classified here as being clear and correctly recorded. In Table 3 we have therefore classified all answers to the Ethnicity question that were recorded clearly although found to be untrue, as being "clear and recorded correctly", in order to maintain consistency with the way the other questions have had to be treated. Table 4 (overleaf) shows what proportion of the ethnicity answers were actually incorrect.

There were more questions in the form used in our second field test, so that only a partial comparison can be made between the quality of the answers given on the two occasions. Where similar questions were asked, however, it is evident that with the exception of the questions about household tenure and ethnicity, the general standard of answers was marginally lower the second time. Little significance should be attached to this, however, as the sample was differently constituted for the second test (containing a greater proportion of Indians, Pakistanis and Turks etc) and the relative position of all but one of the questions remains broadly the same as before. The quality of the answers to the date of birth question fell quite a bit

Table No. 5 Quality of answers - by question type

QUESTION TYPE	ANSWER GIVEN WAS: Clear and recorded correctly	Clear but recorded wrongly	Ambiguous	Omitted	BASE (Total hsehlds/ persons)
	%	%	%	%	
If has outside WC	75	*	1	23	(1519)
Education (B)	82	2	2	14	(2212)
Education (A)	84	1	2	13	(2326)
Household tenure	85	1	4	10	(1519)
Date of birth	86	*	1	13	(1519)
Nationality (A)	86	1	6	8	(3506)
Ethnic origin (B)	86	3	4	7	(3258)
Ethnic origin (A)	86	4	2	8	(3506)
If has inside WC	87	*	4	9	(1519)
If shares hall etc	87	1	*	12	(1519)
Employment	87	2	2	8	(4538)
Number of cars	88	4	1	7	(1519)
If has kitchen sink	90	*	4	6	(1519)
If has hot water	90	1	3	6	(1519)
If has bath/shower	90	*	3	6	(1519)
If has cooker	91	*	3	5	(1519)
Number of rooms	92	1	3	5	(1519)
If shares rooms	92	1	*	7	(1519)
Nationality (B)	92	1	3	4	(3258)
Country of birth (B)	93	1	2	4	(3258)
Country of birth (A)	93	1	2	4	(3506)
Marital status	94	1	*	5	(6806)
Languages	96	1	*	3	(1519)
Sex	96	1	1	2	(6806)

Notes (i) Answers (rightly) recorded under "any other" which were clear, although the box had not been ticked, have been classed as clearly recorded.

(ii) The questions on Education and Employment were answered only by persons aged 16 years and over.

Table No. 4 Quality and accuracy of answers to the ethnicity question - by immigrant generation and ethnic origin

ETHNIC GROUP	GENERATION	ANSWER GIVEN WAS: Correct	Clear and correct, but wrongly recorded	Ambiguous	Incorrect	Omitted	BASE
	%	%	%	%	%	%	(Total persons)
Immigrant White	1st	75	14	1	1	8	(316)
	2nd	78	9	-	*	12	(353)
West Indian	1st	86	1	1	1	12	(452)
	2nd	58	2	3	4	32	(304)
African	1st	89	2	4	1	3	(186)
	2nd	81	3	2	4	10	(108)
Turkish	1st	23	34	20	8	14	(200)
	2nd	26	23	17	12	22	(62)
Mixed descent	2nd only	53	5	16	21	4	(110)
Sch A Hindu, Sikh + Muslim	1st	93	1	2	1	3	(1652)
	2nd	90	*	4	*	5	(469)
Sch B Hindu, Sikh + Muslim	1st	94	*	4	-	2	(1509)
	2nd	94	-	2	-	5	(428)
ALL 1st Generation		88	3	3	1	4	(4319)
All 2nd Generation		78	4	3	3	11	(1843)
Indigenous White		83	2	*	-	15	(620)

Note: Answers (rightly) recorded under "Any other" which were clear and correct, although the box had not been ticked, have been classed as correctly answered

(from 95% to 86% clear and correctly recorded answers), but once again this is attributable to the sample on the second test containing a higher proportion of Indians and Pakistanis who often do not know their exact birth dates.

In Table 4 the answers to the ethnicity question are analysed in greater detail. The overall response to this question, as given in the previous table, indicates that the general quality of the answers was very slightly better on the first test, but when Table 4 is compared with its equivalent in our earlier report[1] we find that it was only the Indigenous Whites who in fact produced a (marginally) better result this time. In every other instance there was a decline in the quality of the response - especially amongst the West Indians. We have found that, confusingly, the reasons for the deterioration were different for each group.

With the West Indians it was omitted answers that were the problem; particularly for the second generation immigrants. The same thing happened on our first field test, but this second time the proportion of omitted answers rose even higher (from 4% to 12% for the first generation, and from 22% to 32% for the second generation). The reason was sometimes said to be simply that the answer had been missed-out accidentally[2], but the most common explanation in relation to the second generation omissions was that parents thought that their UK-born children should be recorded as being European (or English) not as "West Indian". If it had not been for the presence of the word "White" against the first box many would have ticked it to show their children were of European origin, instead of omitting the answer. It is not altogether clear from what was said how much this was due to misunderstanding the question and how much to objections to the principle of classifying people by "race" or colour.

There is little we can do to the format of the question to meet objections to the basic principle of "racial" or ethnic classification, but certain

---

1 See Ethnic Origins ? Table 6, page 19

2 The West Indians appear to have had especial difficulty completing the forms. They complained of having problems with all the questions much more than any other group (see pp 32-33) and it was apparent also from the way in which many of the forms were completed that many were handicapped by a very low standard of literacy. Paradoxically, the informants who had the greatest language difficulty (ie Indians and Pakistanis) generally coped with the form much better because they usually obtained the help of some who could translate it and complete it for them, if they were unable to do it themselves.

changes, which will be discussed later, could be made to try to ensure that any remaining ambiguities in the question are removed.

Amongst the Hindus, Sikhs and Muslims the fall-off in the standard of the answers was very small, especially on the B Schedule. There were two main causes. One was that East African Asians (who constituted a much larger proportion of the sample this time) were occasionally tempted to tick more than one box, or to write something extra into the "Any other" space, to indicate they came from East Africa. Also, like many West Indians, a small proportion of Asians were uncertain about how to classify their UK-born children; which led a few to tick the "White (European descent)" box instead of, or as well as, the "Indian", "Hindu" etc box. When something extra had been written into the "Any other" space the meaning was usually clear and suitable editing at the coding stage could easily remove any ambiguity. The multi-ticking is a more intractable problem and to minimise its occurrence we need to avoid suggesting (as in the instruction on how to record mixed descent on the A Form) that more than one box should be ticked if it is felt that in some sense a person has dual origins - as was understandably sometimes the case with Asians who had been born in East Africa.

The large number of "correct but wrongly recorded" and omitted answers from households in the Immigrant White sample are largely attributable to Greeks, as was the case in our first field test; but this time there was a higher proportion of Greeks in the sample. In Table 5 overleaf, we show how these Greeks (who were mostly Cypriots) actually recorded their ethnicity. As before, a large minority chose to record themselves as of "Any other race or ethnic origin", rather than as "White (European descent)". The descriptions given under "Any other race ..." were usually very clear so they could easily be recoded as "White (European descent)" and do not therefore constitute a problem to us. Their fellow Cypriots of Turkish origin, however, became very confused over how to record themselves and present us with a difficulty less easy to resolve. They are a particularly awkward group to classify in ethnic terms being mostly Muslims who originated in a country which is partly in Europe and partly in the Middle East - and who, to confuse their position yet further, have migrated to Britain from Cyprus. In our first field test the handful of Turks in the sample all described themselves unequivocally as "Turkish" or "Turkish Cypriot" in the "Any other race or ethnic group"

Table No. 5 — How the ethnicity of Greeks was recorded

	RECORDED ETHNICITY AND SCHEDULE TYPE:									
	Recorded as WHITE		Recorded as "Any other"		Recorded as WHITE and "Any other"		No Answer		TOTAL	
Schedule type →	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B
COUNTRY OF BIRTH :-	(no.)		(no.)		(no.)		(no.)		(no.)	
Cyprus	52	50	22	12	2	8	10	6	86	76
Greece	2	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	4	2
England	26	34	5	10	3	-	11	7	45	51
A L L	59%	67%	21%	17%	4%	6%	16%	10%	(135)	(129)

Table No. 6 — How the ethnicity of Turks was recorded

	RECORDED ETHNICITY AND SCHEDULE TYPE:											
	Recorded as WHITE		Recorded as "Any other"		Recorded as WHITE and "Any other"		Recorded as WHITE and MUSLIM		Recorded as MUSLIM		No Answer		TOTAL	
Schedule type →	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B
COUNTRY OF BIRTH :-	(no.)		(no.)		(no.)		(no.)		(no.)		(no.)		(no.)	
Cyprus	35	23	30	9	7	8	-	19	-	12	14	5	86	76
Turkey	6	13	4	3	-	--	-	3	-	-	8	1	18	20
England	15	7	9	2	-	2	-	8	-	4	9	6	33	29
A L L	41%	34%	31%	11%	5%	8%	0%	24%	0%	13%	23%	10%	(137)	(125)

space. None were recorded as "White (European descent)". This time the responses of our much larger sample of Turks were most varied (see Table 6) and include a number of rather enterprising solutions to how to record themselves. Many this time indicated they were Europeans and a lesser proportion put themselves under "Other", but on the B form the presence of a "Muslim" box (intended of course only for Indians, Pakistanis and Bangladeshi) led to a number of quite novel answers. A quarter ticked <u>both</u> "White (European descent)" <u>and</u> "Muslim", whilst 13% simply ticked "Muslim".

The easiest way to resolve their bewilderment would be to insert a box solely for Turks. The objection to a "Turkish" box, however, is that of course Turkey is partly in Europe and a large number of our informants did classify themselves as European - albeit frequently in combination with something else. Provision of a separate box for Turks would imply that we did not consider Turks to be Europeans (a view to which some might legitimately take exception) and also some might still tick "White (European)" because it is the first in the list, or because they object to being otherwise described. No doubt a proportion would tick <u>both</u> boxes. However, any such tendency to multi-tick or only to tick "European" could readily be dealt with by reclassifying <u>all</u> Turks back into the "European" category, at the coding stage. Hence the only real objection to creating a separate category for Turks is that some might take exception to being classified as non-Europeans.

In the second test we tried two alternative methods of recording persons who were of mixed racial or ethnic descent. On the first test it appeared that the question had often been left blank because informants found it difficult to comply with our instruction to <u>describe</u> the ancestry of any person of mixed descent, as well as tick the box. On the B version of the form used in the second test, we therefore omitted the request for a written description but provided a box to tick. On the A form we experimented with trying to get our informants to record mixed descent by multi-ticking. The interviewer was also instructed to find out the ancestry of anyone recorded by either of the two methods, as being of mixed descent, so that we could assess their relative effectiveness.

It is exceedingly hard to obtain an adequate sample of people of mixed ancestry. Unlike our other ethnic minorities they cannot, of course, be

Table No. 7

The recording of MIXED racial or ethnic descent - by type of schedule

	Type of Schedule	
	A	B
	(Nos.)	
PEOPLE GENUINELY OF MIXED ETHNIC DESCENT:-		
Correctly recorded	40	13
Answer clear although incorrectly recorded	15	-
Answer wrong or ambiguous because -		
Ticked "Muslim" as well as/instead of indicating "Mixed Descent"	(DNA)	9
Ticked father's ethnic group as well as/instead of indicating mixed descent	12	2
Shown as "White (European descent)" because UK born	8	2
Uncertain how to record because mixed ancestry was from grandparents' generation	4	-
No answer because question not understood	5	-
Total persons genuinely of mixed descent	84	26
PEOPLE NOT OF MIXED ETHNIC DESCENT		
Wrongly shown as such because:-		
Clerical error only	2	-
Multi-ticked to indicate country of birth and residence, instead of ethnicity	22	(DNA)
Confused mixed nationality with mixed ethnic descent	-	9
Other reasons	6	-
Total persons wrongly shown as being of mixed racial or ethnic descent	30	9

distinguished by name. They are very few in number, at present, so that if one relied solely on locating them by chance, in the other samples, it is unlikely many would be found. So in each field test we have tried to augment their numbers by taking a supplementary sample from one of the few long-established immigrant communities.

For our first field test we went to Bute Town, Cardiff. As this strategem proved successful, on the second occasion we went to another similar area, in Liverpool. However, because it was not possible to know in advance which of the households would prove to contain someone of mixed ancestry, we could not structure the sample to ensure similar numbers appeared on each version of the form, as we were able to do for the other groups. Consequently, in Table 7, where we summarise our findings, it will be seen that we found more persons of mixed descent amongst the households to whom the A form was given, than in the B form sample. This does not imply that the A form was a more effective instrument for detecting mixed ancestry. In fact, neither method proved to be very good. Out of the 85 people on the A form who were found by interviewers to be genuinely of mixed descent, only 55 (65%) were recorded in a way that would have led to them being correctly identified. Fortuitously, the number of genuine mixed descent who were missed was almost exactly balanced by people who were wrongly recorded as such; so that the resultant figure for the number of mixed descent in the A sample proved to be most accurate !

By far the most common reason some people were wrongly recorded as being of mixed ancestry, on the A form, was that they ticked more than one box to indicate their country of birth and residence, instead of their ethnicity. This occurred especially amongst West Indians, to whom the instructions on how to record "mixed descent" occasionally caused yet further confusion over what constituted "European descent" in the description to the first box. Clearly, to ask form-fillers to indicate mixed ancestry by ticking all the boxes that apply is too unreliable.

The meagre number of people of mixed descent who were recorded on the B version of the form did not provide an adequate test of its efficacy. However, as a similar method was used in our first field test we can

utilise the results from both tests to help us to assess its effectiveness. On the first test the form-filler had both to tick a box and describe the person's ancestry, but the question was sometimes left unanswered because informants were perplexed about how to describe mixed ancestry. We surmised therefore that if, as in the second test, the form-filler was asked only to tick the box (or boxes) this might raise the response rate. The results this time, on both the A and the B versions of the question appear now to confirm that this is so. On both forms the number of people who confused mixed ethnicity with mixed nationality was also less than in the first test. This is possibly because of the addition of a question about nationality. On the B version, however, the presence of a "Muslim" box caused confusion not only for Turks but also for persons of part-Turkish ancestry, who were also sometimes recorded as "Muslim" (ie signifying they were Pakistanis etc.) instead of, or as well as, being correctly recorded in the "mixed descent" category.

It is clear therefore that we have to abandon multi-ticking because it is too unreliable, and opt instead for a single box for those of mixed ethnic descent. In order to filter out those who continue to be inappropriately included in this category, however, it appears we need to ask as we did on the first test, for the person's ancestry to be described in writing; despite the evidence that it may lead to a somewhat higher rate of omissions.

As was mentioned earlier, in addition to checking the answers to the ethnicity question we attempted also to check on the reliability of the country of birth information. In the follow-up interview the informant (who was usually the form-filler) was asked to name the town or city (or the nearest town or city) in which he or she was born, and this information was subsequently used to check the accuracy of the answer to the country of birth question in the self-completion questionnaire.

One of the purposes of this question was to ascertain the extent to which immigrants from the Indian Sub-Continent were prone to mis-name their countries of birth because of confusions arising from the partition of India in 1947. It would be understandable, for instance, if some of those who had been born in a part of pre-partition India that was subsequently re-named as Pakistan should say they were born in India, rather than in Pakistan. The

instructions given in the question theoretically cater for this situation, but someone whose knowledge of English is poor might well find them difficult to understand. The results of our check are summarised in Table 8 below.

Table No. 8 Check on the accuracy of own country of birth: as entered by the form-filler.

Country of birth as given by the form-filler:	When check against the locality in which born, country given on form found to be: Correct	Wrong	Unable to verify*	BASE (100%)
	%	%	%	
England, Wales, Scotland or Northern Ireland	95	4	1	366
Elsewhere	92	3	5	1063
A L L	93	3	4	1429

* Ie could not be checked because we could not trace the locality where informant said he was born, or because informant did not know the locality.

NOTES Excludes households where form-filler was not a member of the household (ie where a friend or relative was asked to complet the form on behalf of the head of household because of literacy or language difficulties), or where the country of birth of the form-filler had been omitted from the self-completion form.

Generally speaking, the question was answered accurately, as indeed one might have expected considering the nature of the question. Most of the errors occurred in the Asian sample, as we had anticipated; although even there they were not numerous.

Of the (14) persons said erroneously to have been born in the United Kingdom, 9 were Asians who were confused over the meaning of the instruction to give the "present name" of the country in which they were born - and instead gave the name of the country in which they were living at present ! The others

had also misunderstood the question and usually answered in terms of their nationality at birth.

Of the (29) people born "elsewhere" who also gave the wrong country of birth, 15 said to be Indian-born were actually born in Pakistan, and 6 said to be Pakistan-born were found in fact to have been born in India. These errors were presumably for reasons such as we described earlier[1]. There were also 5 similar confusions amongst other overseas born and 3 who answered wrongly because they misinterpreted the question.

1 See last para, page 19

SECTION FOUR

Response to question on language(s) normally used within the household

In Table 9 we have analysed the answers given to the language question according to household ethnic composition, languages spoken, and the proportion in each group who claimed to be multi-lingual. The question asked the form-filler to "indicate .... the language or languages normally used within this household". This was the first time we had experimented with a question on this topic. It was included to establish if it was practicable to ask a question on these lines, and to enable us to assess from the way it was answered if the data collected would have useful application. As the earlier Table 3 showed, compared with the other questions it produced a very good response; yielding 96% clear and correctly recorded answers for the sample as a whole. The 12% omissions for both West Indians and Africans, which appear in Table 8, are no more than a reflection of the poor standard of literacy of many of the informants in these two groups which resulted in numerous errors, including omissions, on most questions in the schedule[1].

Thus, the question worked well, judging from the apparent ease with which most informants appeared to answer it, but the details of the actual languages spoken and the extent of alleged multi-lingualism cast some doubt on whether the information would be of sufficient practical use to justify its inclusion in a census schedule.

Most households composed of white immigrants said they spoke English at home, although a quarter (nearly all Greeks) also used their mother tongue. At the other end of the scale, however, one finds that although over 60% of both Turkish and Asian households claimed to speak English for at least part of the time when at home, two-thirds of both groups said they also spoke at least one other language as well. One in ten of the Turkish households and one five of the Asian claimed to speak at least three! The third language of the Turks was invariably Greek - a knowledge of which was presumably acquired in Cyprus from where most of them had come, of course. Our polyglot Asians claimed to speak at home a variety of the tongues of the Sub-Continent and a few of those

---

1 See note 2 on page 13

Table No. 9 **Language(s) said to be normally used in the household - by ethnic composition of household**

LANGUAGE(S) NORMALLY USED IN THE HOUSEHOLD	ETHNIC COMPOSITION OF HOUSEHOLD						
	Indigenous White	Immigrant White	Turkish	Hindu Sikh & Muslim	West Indian	African	Mixed Descent
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
English	98	92	62	61	88	85	96
Greek	-	32	11	-	-	-	-
Turkish	-	-	95	-	-	-	4
Hindi	-	-	-	14	-	-	2
Urdu	-	-	-	21	-	-	12
Punjabi	-	-	-	44	-	-	9
Gujarati	-	-	-	47	-	-	5
Bengali	-	-	-	2	-	-	-
Other	-	3	2	2	-	21	5
NUMBER OF LANGUAGES NORMALLY USED:-	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
1 only	98	71	36	34	88	71	72
2	-	27	49	43	-	17	18
3 or more	-	-	11	22	-	-	9
ANSWER OMITTED	2	2	3	1	12	12	2
B A S E (Total Households)	(185)	(223)	(63)	(737)	(169)	(86)	(56)

who had lived in East Africa even included Swahili.

The households of mixed composition nearly all said they spoke English for at least part of the time, and nearly three-quarters spoke nothing else. One in ten, however, claimed like some of the Turks and Asians to speak as many as three or more languages at home.

It is difficult to know how much credence to give to these claims to multilingualism. It looks as though some of the Turks, immigrants from the Indian Sub-Continent and families of mixed ethnic composition have simply told us of all the languages with which they are conversant, including some which they probably seldom if ever use at home - although they might well employ them on other occasions. It is notable that none of the indigenous whites appear to have misunderstood the intention of the question and inserted other languages with which they are familiar. The answers from the white immigrants households also appear to be realistic.

Perhaps the chief use to which this data might be put, is to ascertain the extent to which the children of immigrant families speak English when at home. Such information could be of value to the Department of Education and to others; although no doubt it could equally well be collected by alternative methods. To this end it is of interest that in nearly 40% of the Turkish and Asian households English was not said to be one of the languages normally used. However, the high proportion of households which claimed to speak English and one or more other language as well tells us little that would be of use to educationalists. They need to know the language normally used between the parents and their children; especially those of pre-school age. It is likely, for instance, that in many households the immigrants' mother tongue is the main medium of communication between the adults, whereas they may often if not invariably speak to their children in English. Again, in some households both parents may do this, whilst in others only the father may do so, because the mother may not be able to speak English very well - a point of particular importance if there are children of pre-school age in the family. Thus, a variety of situations may lie beneath the statement that English and the immigrants' mother tongue are both spoken between members of the household.

We could alter the question and ask only for the language most commonly spoken at home, but this would undoubtedly make it more difficult to answer in circum-

stances such as we have just described. It would all depend on who does the most talking! Moreover, it would also fail to distinguish between homes where English is never used, from those where although it may not be the most frequent mode of communication within the family, it is nevertheless employed quite often.

As it would not be feasible to ask more than one general question on this topic, in a census, probably the most useful statistic that we could collect through the medium of a question of this kind, is the proportion of households, in each ethnic group, in which English is said not to be one of the languages normally spoken. To do this we would need to retain the question more or less in the form in which we tested it. Whether this information is of sufficient value to justify the inclusion of a general question on languages in the census would seem to us to be open to doubt, especially as it concerns only a very small proportion of the population and could no doubt be collected along with other useful background detail through other means. Teachers are the most obvious source of information about the level of fluency in English amongst the children of immigrant families when they first start school. Further information, if desired, could be collected by sample surveys of school-age children and their parents, from the relevant ethnic groups.

SECTION FIVE

Reasons for errors, omissions and difficulties

In this Sections we shall examine the reasons given by our form-fillers for their difficulties, in relations to all types of question. To start with, in Table 10 (overleaf) we show the actual number of questions which were said to cause difficulty, to each ethnic group. This table (and also Table 11 which follows) relate to questions with which the form-filler complained of having problems,although he managed to give the correct answers eventually; as well as all the questions which were (wholly or partly) left unanswered or to which ambiguous or incorrect answers were given. It was only in relation to ethnicity and country of birth, however, that we were able to check the answers systematically. There will almost certainly have been other errors and difficulties on the unchecked questions which will have passed undetected and thus both tables probably understate the number of problems these produced. Consequently, the only useful comparisons that can be made are between the overall performances of the different ethnic groups; rather than between the relative level of difficulty said to be associated with the particular types of question[1].

Table 10 shows that the West Indians had far more problems when completing their forms than any of the other groups. Their average number of difficulties per form (5.9 on the A version and 5.6 on the B) was in fact twice as great as for the Hindus, Sikhs and Muslims, who had the next highest difficulty rating. Not surprisingly, the indigenous Whites had the fewest problems. The contrast between the West Indians and Asians, however, is somewhat biased because it conceals the fact that most of the difficulties that some Asian heads of household would have experienced had they attempted personally to complete the forms were circumvented by asking friends and relatives to do it for them, or by getting their children to act as interpreters and scribes.

Asians who have an inadequate knowledge of English often have need for this kind of assistance when completing the innumerable official documents (such

---

1 The best approximation to measuring the relative effectiveness of the questions themselves is in terms of the clarity and completeness of the answers entered on the self-completion forms - a topic we discussed in Section 3.

Table No. 10 Number of questions which caused difficulty to form-fillers: by ethnic composition of household and type of schedule

	ETHNIC COMPOSITION OF HOUSEHOLD											
	Indigenous White		Immigrant White		Hindu, Sikh + Muslim		West Indian		Others*		ALL	
Schedule type	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B
NUMBER OF QUESTIONS CAUSING DIFFICULTY	%		%		%		%		%		%	
None	34	38	32	28	21	23	10	10	28	24	24	25
1 - 5	62	56	62	63	68	63	50	49	64	64	64	61
6 - 10	1	5	5	5	7	7	14	23	3	2	6	8
11 - 15	1	1	3	4	3	6	24	18	5	10	6	7
Average number of questions causing difficulty per form	1.7	1.6	2.2	2.3	2.6	2.8	5.9	5.6	2.5	3.2	2.8	2.9
BASES (Total households)	(83)	(102)	(104)	(119)	(375)	(362)	(88)	(81)	(108)	(97)	(758)	(761)

* Ie Mixed ethnic descent, Turkish and African.

as licence applications, tax returns etc.) with which they inevitably have to deal.

The older West Indians often had difficulties because of a low standard of literacy. Although some were willing to answer the questions, providing the interviewer read each one out and filled-in the form for them (a procedure we had discouraged interviewers from following because we wished to test how well our informants could do it) they seldom if ever asked other people to fill it in for them, as did the Asians. Our interviewers often had the impression that such informants were unwilling to acknowledge the cause of their difficulties - although it was only too evident from the way some of them had attempted to complete their forms. Their embarrassment is understandable, of course, but the problems it led to appeared at times to be aggravated by an indifference or occasionally an outright hostility, toward officialdom and "surveys". Although one suspects that this might often have been a defensive reaction because of their embarrassment at being unable to cope with the form.

In Table 11 (overleaf) we have summarised the reasons each group of informants gave for their errors and omissions, and their other difficulties. Problems with the ethnicity question are shown separately because they are of particular interest to us. The proportion of people who were said to be confused over or unsure how to answer the ethnicity question is appreciably higher than for the other questions in all groups except for the Asians. As we noted earlier, this may be due in part to our having checked the ethnicity answers more thoroughly than the others. It should also be recalled that although the proportion of form-fillers who are reported to have had problems is, on average, lower for other questions in the schedule, the quality of the answers to these other questions varied considerably and several were in fact answered less satisfactorily than the question on ethnicity[1].

The reasons people were uncertain how to record their ethnic origins have already been discussed in Section 3. In particular, it should be noted that the especially high proportion of West Indians who said they were unsure how to answer the question were mainly referring to the ethnic classification of their UK-born children.

---

1 See Table 3, page 11

Table No. 11

Reasons for errors, omissions and difficulties

- by ethnic composition of household

Reasons for errors, omissions and difficulties	ETHNIC COMPOSITION OF HOUSEHOLD											
	Indigenous Whites		Immigrant Whites		West Indians		Hindus, Sikhs & Muslims		Africans, Turks & Mixed Descent		TOTAL	
	Ethnic Origin Qn	All Other Qns	Ethnic Origin Qn	All Other Qns	Ethnic Origin Qn	All Other Qns	Ethnic Origin Qn	All Other Qns	Ethnic Origin Qn	All Other Qns	Ethnic Origin Qn	All Other Qns
	%		%		%		%		%		%	
Confused over / unsure how to answer question	9	2	14	3	22	7	3	6	13	3	9	5
Clerical errors	4	3	4	3	7	7	3	3	5	3	4	4
Qn. thought irrelevant or too personal / answer obvious	8	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	1	2	1
Answer written-in under "other" but box unticked	-	*	1	*	-	1	-	1	1	1	*	1
Information not known	-	*	-	*	-	1	-	2	-	1	-	1
Other difficulties	1	*	2	1	1	1	*	*	1	*	1	*

Perhaps the most noteworthy point brought out by Table 11 is that the West Indians appear to have had more trouble than the other groups with all types of questions and for practically all the reasons listed. This bears out our previous conclusion that this group had especial difficulty with the form because many of them were handicapped by a low standard of literacy.

The explanation for why 8% of indigenous Whites considered the ethnicity question "irrelevant" etc is that they generally thought it was obvious they were "White Europeans" because of their names and country of birth.

Another topic in which we have especial interest because it it the first time we have introduced it into our schedule and because legal complexities make it a subject difficult to ask about, is nationality. During the follow-up interview we enquired especially about any difficulties the informant might have had when answering this question. The answers are summarised in Table 12. Most of the difficulties related to whether or not a person, having now become a resident of the UK, still retained the nationality of his or her country of origin. Once again we find that it was the West Indians who were the most confused.

We experimented with two versions of the question, and also asked the form-filler to record if the person had more than one nationality. The 'A' version asked for each person to be categorised as a "Citizen of the United Kingdom of England, Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland" or as "Any other nationality". Six percent of the people who were entered on this version were thought by the form-fillers possibly or definitely to have <u>dual</u> nationality. On the 'B' version, however, on which the alternative categories to be ticked were "British" or "Any other nationality", only 4% were thought definitely or possibly to have more than one nationality.

Dual nationality appears therefore not to be a very serious problem, but one which appears to occur rather less frequently when nationality is expressed in terms of whether the person is British. This is to be expected, of course, as most of the people in our samples were "British" in one sense or another. Thus even though some might still have (or think they have) dual <u>citizenship</u>, they can still think of their <u>nationality</u> as just "British".

Table No. 12 Form-fillers who said they found NATIONALITY question difficult - by ethnic composition of household

	ETHNIC COMPOSITION OF HOUSEHOLD					
	Indigenous White	Immigrant White	West Indian	Hindu, Sikh & Muslim	African, Turkish & Mixed	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Difficulty mentioned spontaneously by infmt	2	3	9	3	4	4
After prompting -						
said question caused difficulty	1	2	10	7	6	6
gave other / irrelevant answers	-	1	3	1	2	1
NO DIFFICULTY mentioned	97	94	78	89	88	89
BASE (Total hseholds)	(185)	(223)	(169)	(737)	(205)	(1519)

SECTION SIX

Questions that were disliked

In the course of the follow-up interview we asked each informant not only about the difficulties he or she had encountered when filling-in the form, but also if there were any questions that were disliked. Table 13 (overleaf) summarises their answers. There was a wide variety of objections but none of the questions elicited a very hostile response. The ethnicity question produced the most complaints but even here it was only from 1 in 50 of our respondents. The most frequent objections on this score were from persons of Jewish extraction in the immigrant white group. This especial sensitivity amongst Jews was encountered in the first field test also. West Indians this time raised fewer spontaneous objections to the question on ethnicity, but expressed dislike of a wider range of the topics covered, than any other group. As many as one in twenty said they did not like being asked about their education.

In Table 14, also overleaf, we have brought together the objections to the ethnicity question made at all stages of the survey, for comparison with a similar table (No. 11) in our earlier report. Previously, 5% of the total sample had expressed objections at some stage of the survey. This time the objectors were reduced to 3%. On the second trial fewer people refused totally to complete the questionnaire because of disliking this particular question. Those who did co-operate were also less likely to express misgivings about it in the interview; but this is at least partly because on the previous test, at the end of the interview, we also asked a direct question about the desirability of collecting information about ethnicity, which prompted yet a further number to register doubts. On both occasions it was the West Indians who most frequently said they disliked it.

In the first field trial, when we asked for our informants' views on the desirability of collecting information about "race or ethnic origins", in the Census, we found the great majority in all groups were either in favour or indifferent. In the follow-up interview on the second test we tried asking

Table No. 13 Questions that form-fillers disliked answering - by ethnic composition of household

QUESTIONS DISLIKED	ETHNIC COMPOSITION OF HOUSEHOLD					
	A L L	Indigenous White	Immigrant White	West Indian	Hindu, Sikh or Muslim	Turkish, African or Mixed
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Ethnicity	2	1	4	3	2	2
Education	1	-	1	5	*	3
No. of cars	1	2	1	4	*	1
No./if shares rooms or hall	1	1	1	1	*	*
Household amenities	1	1	1	2	1	*
Hsehld tenure	1	1	*	2	*	1
Marital status	*	3	-	1	*	-
Nationality	*	1	-	2	1	-
Relationship to H O H	*	2	1	1	-	-
Employment	*	1	-	2	-	1
Date of birth	*	-	2	1	*	-
Country of birth	*	-	-	1	1	*
Languages	*	-	1	1	*	1
Name	*	1	*	1	-	-
Sex	*	1	-	-	-	-
Disliked ALL the questions	1	-	*	1	*	2
NOTHING said to be disliked	92	93	89	83	94	89
BASE (Total hseholds)	(1519)	(185)	(223)	(169)	(737)	(205)

Table No. 14 Summary of objections to ethnicity question, made at all stages of the survey - by ethnic composition of household

	ETHNIC COMPOSITION OF HOUSEHOLD					
	Indigenous White	Immigrant White	West Indian	Hindu, Sikh & Muslim	African, Turkish & Mixed	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Persons refusing totally to co-operate, at least partly because of having objections to the ethnicity question	*	1	3	*	2	1
Others who completed the form but expressed misgivings about ethnicity question in interview	*	2	2	2	2	2
TOTAL OF OBJECTIONS MADE AT ALL STAGES OF SURVEY	1	3	5	2	4	3
BASE (Total of contacted households including those where contact was made but form/interview was not completed)	(217)	(327)	(229)	(807)	(287)	(1867)

Notes: (i) It is also likely that amongst those who refused to co-operate for reasons that were unclear, or from whom we were unable to collect a Self-Completion Form or to obtain an interview, there were some who were reluctant to co-operate because they took exception to the question on ethnicity.

(ii) In the previous field-test in addition to asking everyone if there were any questions they disliked we also asked those who did not spontaneously mention a dislike of the ethnicity question what were their personal views about collecting information on this topic, in future censuses. Naturally, this prompted some others also to express doubts which were added to those which had been mentioned spontaneously to produce the total of objections made at all stages of the survey, as given in our previous report. This almost certainly accounts for the lower proportion who this time completed the form but were said to have misgivings about the question.

Table No. 15 Form-fillers' preferred type of ethnicity question - by ethnic composition of household

PREFERRED TYPE OF QUESTION	ETHNIC COMPOSITION OF HOUSEHOLD: Indig-enous White	Immg-rant White	Turkish	Hindu Sikh + Muslim	West Indian	African	Mixed Descent	TOTAL
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Parents' country of birth	13	9	9	13	24	15	9	13
Direct qn. about racial or ethnic origin	25	25	19	23	27	31	27	24
Both types of question equally acceptable	57	56	56	49	43	45	60	51
Neither type of question is acceptable	1	*	-	1	2	1	-	1
Other answers	4	8	12	9	2	4	3	7
No answer (including did not understand the question)	1	2	3	5	2	4	2	4
BASE (Total hsehlds)	(185)	(223)	(63)	(737)	(169)	(86)	(56)	(1519)

instead for the opinions of our informants on the relative "acceptability" of a question on parents' birthplaces compared with a direct question about race or ethnic origins of the kind they had just answered. As Table 15 shows, overall, a half said they found both types of question to be equally acceptable. One in four definitely preferred a direct question about ethnicity and only 13% said they would rather have a question on parents' birthplaces. Many, however, had difficulty understanding what we meant, so this result can only be taken as a very general indication of the strength of feeling on this issue.

It is interesting, nevertheless, that it was West Indians who were most in favour of asking for the parents' birthplace. This may relate to their feelings about the way their UK-born children should be classified, discussed in Section 3. Although, of course, if these children were to be classified according to their parents' birthplace they would be treated as "West Indian" - the very label which some of their parents thought to be inappropriate on our form. Both these responses, however, spring from the same sentiment that it should be country of birth (whether of the parents' or of the individual) that should determine a person's "ethnicity"; rather than some abstract notion of racial or cultural differences. Undoubtedly this is what some West Indians do feel, because of their "racial" heterogeneity and highly westernised culture.

S E C T I O N S E V E N

Conclusions and recomendations

As in our previous field trial the ethnicity question met with reasonable success, but we still remain with a number of difficulties for which we need to seek a solution.

1. The chief difficulty with West Indians is still the high incidence of omitted answers in respect of the UK-born. We had hoped that by inserting a question about nationality before the one on ethnicity we would reduce this problem. This did not work. To the extent that these omissions result from misunderstanding the question, there are two ways we can deal with them. First, we need to remove any ambiguity resulting from the use of the expression "European descent" in the description to the first box. Second, an instruction needs to be inserted, making it clear that persons of West Indian descent or ancestry should be recorded in the same way as people who were actually born in the West Indies. This will not satisfy those who object to the principle of classifying people according to their "racial" origins, but should help at least to remove any remaining ambiguity about what they are being asked to do.

   The simplest way to avoid any misunderstanding arising from our use of the expression "European descent" is to omit it altogether and to label the first box simply as "White" - see the new B version of the question we propose using in the next field trial, at Appendix I. We feel, however, that this solution might prove offensive to some people (and not only West Indians) because of its uncompromising emphasis on "colour". We propose, therefore, that further trials be undertaken also with an alternative version which retains the word "European" in the title of the first box but drops the word "descent" - see new version A. An instruction has also been inserted, in both of the new versions of the question, which explains to the form-filler how to record persons who although not immigrants themselves, are descended from immigrants.

2. Both versions of the question used in our last trial worked relatively well for immigrants (and their descendents) from the Sub-Continent of India and East African Asians. But we found that on the version where they were asked to indicate their country of origin only, some also wrote in their religion; whilst on the version asking for religious community only, some also indicated which country they came from - usually by ticking or underlining the name of the country in the instructions to the question. This propensity to insist on giving both religious community and the area or country of origin was a characteristic virtually unique to the Indians, Pakistanis, Bangladeshi and Sri Lankans. Some of the Turks gave answers which could be construed as reflecting a wish to identify themselves in a similar way; but because of the widespread confusion amongst our Turkish respondents as to which race or ethnic group they belonged it is difficult to know what significance to attach to the different answers they gave.

The tendency for Indians and Pakistanis etc to give both their area of origin and religion, when asked to describe their ethnicity, reflects how ethnic or cultural identities are in fact formed in the Sub-Continent, where language differences between areas reinforce the social bonds created by residential propinquity or kinship, and provide an alternative and complementary frame of reference to communal differences based on religion. Thus, it is natural for a person to describe himself as say a "Punjabi Sikh" or "Gujerati Hindu" since by so doing he is stating not only his religious community but also his mother tongue and the area he originates from. All of which continue to be important to the migrant in determining the social group(s) amongst his fellow immigrants with whom he feels himself to be closely identified and with whom he can most easily settle and interact socially. Or, in other words, this is how he himself naturally thinks of his "ethnic" status. This was borne out by the results of our first field test (in which only one box was provided for immigrants from anywhere in India, Pakistan or Bangladesh) and consequently in the second test we experimented with sub-dividing them either by country of origin or by religious community, to establish if it was practicable to get people to classify themselves on one dimension only, and if so which was the most effective of the two. We have now

found that both forms of classification work well, but that there remains a small minority who feel sufficiently strongly about it to insist on inserting the additional information (area of origin or religion) because they evidently consider it to be necessary to give both in order properly to define their own view of their ethnic identity.

It would therefore seem logical now to test out asking for both country of origin and religion, to ascertain if this would be universally acceptable to everyone in the groups concerned. If this proves to be so, then the collection of this more detailed information would be justifiable on the grounds that it corresponds most closely with our respondents' own view of their ethnicity, as well as increasing the potential usefulness of the data for policymakers and others. We have, therefore, now inserted (in both the new versions of the form) a box for each of the countries in the Sub-Continent, in conjunction with a box for each of the main religions. We have also added an arrow and two sets of instructions (one in the panel at the side and one incorporated into the question itself) to emphasise that they (and only they) have to tick two boxes. One to show where they have originated from and one to indicate to which religious community they belong.

3. Hopefully, the changes we have made to the layout of the question for Hindus, Sikhs and Muslims from India and Pakistan etc. will help to make it clear that the "Muslim" box applies only if a person's origins are in the Indian Sub-Continent and not to members of other Islamic groups, such as Turks and Arabs. We have already discussed the merits and disadvantages of inserting a separate "Turkish" box[1]. For the reasons given previously we are dubious about doing so, but in view of the obvious inadequacy of the previous layout to accommodate the Turks, we have decided to insert a separate box into the new A version of the question, to enable us to test empirically whether it would significantly improve the quality of the answers, as it would seem reasonable to suppose; and whether on the other hand it produces a hostile response from some people, as we fear it may.

4. In both of the new versions of the question we have amalgamated the boxes for "Mixed descent" and "Any other race or ethnic group". This is because

---

1 See pages 14-16

it is sometimes difficult for form-fillers to decide under which of these two headings to place a person. We have also asked the form-filler, if he ticks this box, to describe the person's ethnic origins. This will ensure that whatever the circumstances are that have led the informant to conclude that the person concerned cannot be included in any of the listed categories, at least we will know why and can decide ourselves how best to code the person. It is true that previous experience suggests that the request for a description may result in the question being left unanswered more often in respect of persons of mixed descent, but this is a lesser evil than having a wrong answer given. It is also probably easier for a Census Enumerator to spot a missing answer, than one that is wrong.

5. It will also be noted that we have changed the expression "Ethnic Origin" to "Ethnic Group", in the title of the question. The change will probably make little difference to most people, but theoretically it should help to remove any impression that we are enquiring only about where people <u>came from</u>. One of the sources of difficulty inherent to the question is that the titles we have to give to ethnic minorities usually derive from the names of particular areas of the world (eg The West Indies, China etc) and so the question can be misconstrued to mean country of birth and/or the country in which a person was living before coming to Britain. The fact that relatively few people, other than West Indians, mistook our intentions despite this inherent ambiguity, indicates that our classification does effectively distinguish between groups that are generally recognisable and with which people readily identify. The root of our difficulty with the West Indian informants is that, in contrast to the other "coloured" minorities, the characteristics that in practice distinguish a West Indian (especially a second generation immigrant) from a white European are more "racial" than cultural. Which of course is why West Indian parents often wished to describe their UK-born children as (black) Europeans. The title to the question states explicitly, however, that it is about a person's "race" as well as cultural (or "ethnic") group. The term "race" is of dubious merit, especially when used in connection with a population as heterogeneous as the West Indians; but in the loose popular sense in which we have perforce to employ it here, it embraces the kind of distinction we are asking our West Indian respondents to make.

6. We remain with the subsidiary problem of the minority of indigenous Whites who leave the ethnicity question unanswered because they think it applies only to immigrants. On the second test these amounted to 15%, which is only slightly more than the proportion of omissions on the two versions of the education question (14% and 13% respectively) and was actually lower than on the question about an outside WC, which produced as many as 23% omissions. Nevertheless, it is something we should try to reduce if we can, as it would demand much checking from Census Enumerators to ensure the question was answered and would be an important potential source of error, since it affects the great majority of the population. To this end, it is hoped that the changes we are making to the description attached to the first box, in order to resolve the problems over the classification of West Indians, will also make it clearer to indigenous Whites that the question applies to them, as well as to immigrants. One anticipates that the version in which the first box is labelled simply "White" without the possibly ambiguous references to "European" or "European descent", will be the most successful. But this has to be tested and moreover we have also to ascertain how West Indians will react to it.

7. After discussion with the Census Working Party, it has been agreed that it would now be appropriate to merge the next field trial of the ethnicity question with the Census Pre-Test to be held next September. This will have the double advantage that it will provide a much larger sample of the general population (3,000 households) on which to test the alternative descriptions attached to the first box and also it will enable the question to be presented in the context of a conventional census form.

To enable us to obtain a sufficiently large number of persons in the principle minority groups, the main Census Pre-Test sample will need to be augmented by similar methods to those adopted in our previous field trials. This time, however, we can confine ourselves to the groups who still raise problems which need to be resolved. We propose, therefore, to take a sample of 450 immigrant households of Indian Sub-Continental origin, evenly divided between Hindus, Muslims and Sikhs, including a proportion from East Africa; 400 Turkish households and 400 West Indian. This will provide a set sample of at least 200 from each group on which to test each version of the form.

Revised Ethnicity Questions for testing in next round of fieldwork

VERSION A

RACE or ETHNIC GROUP

i) Tick the appropriate box to show the race or ethnic group to which the person belongs **or from which the person is descended.**

ii) If the person is of **Indian, Pakistani, Bangladeshi** or **Sri Lankan** origin or descent, **also** tick one of the boxes numbered 12 to 15.

iii) If the person's race or ethnic group is **not one of those listed** or if the person is descended from **more than one** race or ethnic group, tick box 11 and describe in full, in the space provided.

1 ☐ White (European)
2 ☐ West Indian
3 ☐ African
4 ☐ Arab
5 ☐ Turkish
6 ☐ Chinese
7 ☐ Indian
8 ☐ Pakistani
9 ☐ Bangladeshi
10 ☐ Sri Lankan

If Indian, Pakistani, Bangladeshi or Sri Lankan, please **also** tick one box below:-

Hindu Sikh Muslim Other

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

12 13 14 15

11 ☐ Any **other** race or ethnic group, or if of **mixed** racial or ethnic descent (please describe below)

. . . . . .

. . . . . .

. . . . . .

Revised Ethnicity Questions for testing in next round of fieldwork

VERSION B

RACE or **ETHNIC GROUP**

i) Tick the appropriate box to show the race or ethnic group to which the person belongs **or from which the person is descended.**

ii) If the person is of **Indian, Pakistani, Bangladeshi** or **Sri Lankan** origin or descent, **also** tick one of the boxes numbered 11 to 14.

iii) If the person's race or ethnic group is **not one of those listed** or if the person is descended from **more than one** race or ethnic group, tick box10 and describe in full, in the space provided.

1 ☐ White

2 ☐ West Indian

3 ☐ African

4 ☐ Arab

5 ☐ Chinese

6 ☐ Indian

7 ☐ Pakistani

8 ☐ Bangaladeshi

9 ☐ Sri Lankan

If Indian, Pakistani, Bangladeshi or Sri Lankan, please **also** tick one box below:-

Hindu ☐ 11 Sikh ☐ 12 Muslim ☐ 13 Other ☐ 14

10 ☐ Any **other** race or ethnic group, or if of **mixed** racial or ethnic descent

(please describe below)

. . . . . .

. . . . . .

. . . . . .

How the sample was selected

A larger sample of 1910 addresses was selected on this second stage of the survey, because two versions of the form had to be tested this time and a greater range of ethnic groups were to be included. The sample of addresses for each ethnic group was selected from the current Electoral Rolls, from areas known to contain a high proportion of the group concerned. The Cypriot, African and Asian households could be readily distinguished by name. It was also found that West Indian households could be identified with a fairly high degree of accuracy, from their forenames. The sample of addresses from which we hoped to obtain a number of persons of mixed ethnic descent, to augment those found in the other samples, was obtained by taking a random sample of households from a long established immigrant community in Liverpool.

The areas from which the samples of each group were obtained, are listed below:-

Ethnic Group	Areas	No. of addresses
West Indians	Birmingham	120
	Lambeth	120
European Immigrants	Barnet	120
	Tower Hamlets	120
Greek and Turkish Cypriots	Haringey Islington Hackney	220
Africans	Haringey Islington	110
Asians: Sikhs	Gravesend	110
	Slough	110
Muslims	Bradford	220
Hindus	Bolton	220
East African origin	Leicester	220
Mixed ethnic descent	Liverpool	110
Indigenous Whites	Norwich Lincoln Tiverton	110

On the previous stage of the survey only one named household was interviewed, at each address. As a proportion of the households had moved, this procedure led to a shortfall in the number of achieved interviews in certain ethnic groups. It was, therefore, decided this time to interview whichever household(s) was now found to be living at the address.

Fieldwork Report

PROCEDURE FOR CONTACTING AND INTERVIEWING SELECTED HOUSEHOLDS

Interviewers were asked to work in a manner similar to that used previously on Census Pretest Surveys ie. at each selected household the interviewer was expected to leave a self-completion form with a responsible adult and to make an appointment to collect the form and interview whichever household member had completed it.

In cases where the form-filler could not read or write English, the interviewer could rely on the assistance of an interpreter for both completing the form and for the subsequent interview. The interpreter could be anyone whom the form-filler relied on to deal with such papers. In some households, the interpreter could be a child under 18. No lower age limit was set in these cases; it was left to the interviewers' judgment to decide whether the child was capable of acting as an interpreter.

On this stage, interviewers were discouraged from being present when the form was being completed. The reason for this was to prevent the form-filler from consulting the interviewer, so that what was entered on the form would approximate the answers the form-filler would give on the 10 yearly census. Some exceptions were made to this rule for cases where the household was clearly not capable of completing the form without assistance (eg. very elderly single-person households). Here it would have been very poor public relations to refuse to give assistance. Any cases where the interviewer had to complete the form were to be noted on the questionnaire.

This arrangement worked reasonably well. Had the interviewer sat through the form-filling but tried to discourage the form-filler from consulting her, the whole exercise could have appeared to the form-filler as a test of his ability to complete the form. By separating the form-filling from the interview this problem was avoided. On the other hand, some cooperation may have been sacrificed from those who find form-filling difficult. Having failed to cope with the form on their own, their inclination was to reject the survey altogether. This problem is, I feel, unavoidable considering the aims of the survey.

SURVEY RECEPTION

One of the main purposes of the survey was to test the reactions of different groups to being asked questions about their race or ethnic origin. Apart from asking the form-filler directly how he or she felt about the questions on the self-completion form, some of the interviewers were also asked to assess the reactions of the people they contacted. A summary of their comments is given below:

Descendants from the Indian Sub-Continent

Although the sample covered a wider range of groups this time, the reception from most groups was still very good. The reason for the good reception was not in any way related to the subject matter of the survey. Rather it was attributable to the courteous nature of most Indians. They took it for granted that they should comply with any requests made by the government.

The one Indian group where the response was not quite as good - though still favourable when compared to the overall response of all groups - was the Sikhs. The main reason for the lower response would appear to be language difficulties. There seemed to be more cases among this group where no-one in the household had a good enough command of English to complete the form.

Although the self-completion form was well received, and very few objections were made about the question on race, the same disquiet was expressed as at the previous stage; namely that some of the Indians interviewed may have had reservations about any system which identified people by race but felt it would be discourteous to say so.

Turkish/Greek Cypriots

The main problem with this group was language. Approximately 20% of the refusals were due to the fact that the interviewer was unable to find anyone who spoke sufficient English to complete the interview. In addition half of the partial interviews (3% of the total Cypriot sample) were also due to language difficulties. In these cases, the household had enlisted the help of a friend or relative in order to complete the form but the interviewer was unable to conduct the follow-up interview as the form-filler was not accessible and no-one in the household spoke sufficient English. Consequently the low response rate for the Cypriot sample did not appear to be related in any way to the subject matter of the survey but was simply due to the difficulty in communicating with some of the selected households.

Jews

Only one interviewer reported on this group. She did not experience any problems, but as the households in her quota were all drawn from a very working-class area their response to the survey may not be fully typical.

Indigenous White Population

On the previous test stage, the indigenous white sample was selected from an area where there was also a large non-white population. On this stage, the indigenous white sample was selected from three areas where there were few immigrants. Consequently although in the last stage there was positive support for the subject matter of the survey, in this stage the attitude of the indigenous whites was one of indifference. The feeling this time was that questions on race did not apply to themselves.

West Indians, Africans and other non-whites

The general feeling was that the initial reception was fairly good. Most households accepted the form readily; but on recall, the reception was not as good. This cooler reaction may be due to:

1. Inability to complete the form:

   The educational standard of some of the households in these three sampled groups was low. Interviewers suspected that the cooler reception on recall was due to the fact that the form-filler didn't want to admit that he/she didn't understand how to complete the form. Rather than lose face they made endless excuses.

2. Uneasiness about being identified by race:

   Apart from the West Indians, who were more outspoken than the other groups, the question on race was rarely ever commented on. Several interviewers, however, felt that the subject matter was the reason why some of the forms were returned blank. The mood at the recall was sufficiently different from the original call to indicate that the unwillingness to complete the form was not due simply to apathy.

As on the previous stage, the West Indians were the most reluctant of all the groups. This applied to all areas in which they were sampled; namely London, Birmingham and Liverpool. Their attitude tended to be rather anti-establishment; and consequently they were suspicious as to how the government would use the information. This view was expressed both by some of the West Indians who refused to take part in the survey and by some of those who co-operated.

QUALITY OF DATA ON SELF-COMPLETION FORM:

Although the main aim of the survey was to test the acceptability and accuracy of a self-completion question on racial origin, it was clear from the interviewers' reports that people also had difficulty with some of the other questions on the form. Unfortunately it was not one of the aims of the survey to test the accuracy of other census questions; and so there is no way of saying with any certainty whether there was a higher error rate than would be expected for the population as a whole, but this would seem likely bearing in mind the language difficulties some of sampled households faced.

MINORITY GROUPS METHODOLOGY SURVEY II

Interviewers' Instructions

This is the second stage of the survey. The first round of fieldwork was done in Cardiff, Leicester and London during June and July of last year.

The main purpose of the survey, as explained on the cover page of the self-completion schedule and in the hand-out leaflet, is to explore alternative methods of distinguishing racial or ethnic minority groups, for possible future use in the census and in social surveys. Up to now the census, for example, has simply used parents' birthplace as an indicator of ethnic origins; but for the reasons detailed in the hand-out leaflet, this is often an inaccurate indication of ethnicity and will become increasingly unsatisfactory as the years go by.

We are therefore now attempting a more direct method of collecting this information. People are being asked, in the self-completion schedule, to tell us themselves what they consider to be their "race or ethnic origin". If you look at the categories listed at Q8 on the self-completion forms, you may think that it looks to be a relatively straight-forward matter. But is is not as simple as it appears.

The terms "origin" or "descent" are ambiguous and many people who are "coloured" or "black", but were born in this country, may (quite legitimately) wish to describe themselves as being of European descent or origin. This is one of the reasons the word "White" has been added to the first category listed at Q8 on the self-completion form. This addition, however, does not wholly overcome the problem, because although it may succeed in dissuading an English-born "black" person from ticking the first box, it does not alter the fact that he may still wish to stress that he is European born and therefore object to being forced to describe himself simply as being of "West Indian", "Pakistani" or "Nigerian" etc. descent or origin.

This brings us to another difficulty: the willingness of people in general to answer questions of this sort. As we have said in the hand-out leaflet, questions of this kind have been incorporated in the censuses of several other countries which have a racially or ethnically diverse population for many years now. In Britain, however, it has not been tried out on a large scale before. An equally important objective of this present enquiry is therefore to ascertain the acceptability of such questions, amongst the population at large.

To sum up, therefore, the survey may be said to have two prime aims, namely:

1. To find out how people feel about giving details of their racial or ethnic origins (particularly, in this instance, in the context of a census-type questionnaire).

and

2. To test how effectively the question on the form distinguishes between members of different racial or ethnic groups.

We are, however, also taking advantage of this opportunity to try out alternative ways of collecting information about a number of other topics, including two others that are new to the Census - eg nationality and languages spoken at home. It is likely that a question on nationality will have to be introduced into the next (1981) Census to meet EEC requirements.

As we are testing alternative ways of collecting information on a number of topics, we are using two different self-completion questionnaires. There are also two alternative versions of the Follow-up Interview Schedule to match; the latter differ, however, only in relation to the wording and instructions at Q7 (Mixed Descent).

THE SAMPLE has been specially selected (from the Electoral Roll) so as to consist predominantly of households containing people of immigrant origin. Most of the adults in these households will be first generation immigrants, but we have endeavoured to ensure that there is also a proportion of second generation included. Indigenous white households are represented as well, since they form the great majority of the population and consequently we need to make sure the questions are understandable and acceptable to them also.

The principal immigrant groups represented are West Indians, Asians (including people of Asian origin from East Africa), Africans, Cypriots (both Greek and Turkish) and Continental Europeans. You will find that (with the exception of Islington, Haringey and Liverpool) each area sample will consist predominantly of households from one immigrant group. This is for sampling reasons, but an incidental advantage is that it will help to familiarise you with the more common complications and difficulties encountered by a particular immigrant group, when completing the ethnicity and nationality questions in particular.

THE SAMPLING UNIT is the household. At each address you will be expected to leave a self-completion form for each household to complete up to a maximum of three households per address.

Selecting households at a multi-household address

If one, two or three households live at the address - take all; if there are 4 or more households at the address, take three by working through the surnames in the order listed on your address list until three households have been obtained. If persons of these names no longer live there take the persons now living in the accommodation formerly occupied by the named persons. If accommodation cannot be identified in this way, make a list of the new occupants, recording them alphabetically. Select from these as above.

Do not delete any addresses to compensate for extra households identified.

Use of A and B versions of forms

There are two different versions of the self-completion forms to be tested. These are labelled A and B and are matched to two versions of the interview schedule, also marked A and B.

The A version should be used in all cases where the fifth (heavily outlined) digit of the serial number is even and the B version where the fifth digit is odd.

Take the following examples:

							h/h	
Ex.1)	Srl No	1	2	0	0	1	1	- use B version
Ex.2)	Srl No	1	2	0	0	2	-	- use A version
Ex.3)	Srl No	1	2	0	0	3	2	- use B version
Ex.4)	Srl No	1	2	0	0	4	-	- use A version

In the first and third examples the fifth digit is an odd number. You will, therefore, use version B. In the second and fourth examples the numbers are even, and therefore you will use version A.

Serial Numbers

Your address list contains a 5-digit serial number. The sixth digit, the household number, you will need to add yourself once you establish the number of households at the address.

If there is only one household at the address put a dash in this box. e.g.

						h/h no.
Srl No.	1	2	0	0	3	-

If there is more than one household at the address allocate household numbers 1 and 2 or 1, 2 and 3 to the selected households.

Contacting Procedure

Prior to leaving any self-completion forms at an address you will need to.

1. Establish the number of households at the address.
2. Select up to a maximum of 3 households (see above).
3. Speak to one responsible adult in each household selected.
4. Establish from the responsible adult the number of people who live in the household. (If more than 6, leave 2 forms.)
5. Establish from the responsible adult which household member would normally complete the census form.
6. Arrange appointment to see form-filler. (Preferably no more than 2 to 3 days after leaving the form.) Emphasize that you will want to speak to the form filler in person.
7. Complete front of form giving name of form-filler, address, serial no. and date of return appointment. Remember also to make a note of the return appointment in your notebook.

N.B. If after several attempts, you are unable to arrange a time when you can interview the form-filler, it is possible to interview another responsible household member. On the interview schedule you will see that there are alternative wordings to allow for this.

If when you call to collect the form you find that it has not been completed, ask the form filler to do it whilst you wait. If the form-filler asks your advice on how to complete the form, ask him/her to complete as much of the form on their own as they can as you would like to discuss with them afterwards those questions they found difficult or were uncertain how to answer.

Introducing the Survey:

Although the survey is primarily concerned with finding ways of accurately distinguishing various ethnic and racial groups, we would prefer <u>not</u> to make an issue of this at the introductory stage. Consequently in introducing the survey on the doorstep and prior to beginning the interview, concentrate on explaining the need to test new questions prior to the next Censuses in order to find out (i) how well the questions work and (ii) how people feel about answering them. Do not make specific reference to the questions on race or nationality.

If however your informant notices the questions on race you may explain the reason for the inclusion of these questions along the lines given in the leaflet and on page 1 of these instructions.

Refusal to fill in self-completion forms

If the form-filler refuses to complete any part of the self-completion form, complete a non-response form giving a full explanation of the form-fillers reason for refusing. Particularly try to ascertain whether the refusal is because of objections to the questions on racial/ethnic origin or for some other reason.

THE FOLLOW-UP INTERVIEW

Every self-completion form which a householder has made at least some real attempt to fill-in, should be returned to the office, together with a follow-up interview schedule.

Ensure your name, authorisation number, and the dates the self-completion form was delivered and collected, are entered on the cover page.

SECTION A Should be completed only if the informant refuses to answer any further questions. Remember, after recording as fully as possible the reasons for the refusal, also to complete Q10 at the end of the schedule and to give out a PINK leaflet.

SECTION B For everyone who is willing to answer the additional questions, go to Q1 on page 2.

Q1 When you ask this question you may discover that the items which have caused difficulty have been left blank or answered incorrectly. If this is the case, as well as noting the cause of the difficulty, ensure that you find out and record clearly what the correct answer(s) should have been. Do not alter what the informant has written on the self-completion form.

Q2 The purpose of this question is really to find out as much as possible about how people decide what is their nationality. To determine conclusively if a person's nationality has been correctly described, however, we would have to ask several questions about each person's personal history. The law on nationality is very complex and a person's precise legal status may depend, for example, on when and where they were born; how long they have lived in Britain; if they have registered as a UK citizen (for persons of Commonwealth origin) or have been naturalised (if of "alien" origin); if they have ever been married or adopted by a person of different nationality; and even whether one of their grandparents was native to Britain. To ascertain all this information would entail an interrogation rather than an interview, which in the present circumstances would be impolitic. In any case, the law on nationality is currently being revised by the Home Office because of the need to simplify it - partly to enable a more comprehensible question to be asked in the next Census.

We have nevertheless introduced a question on nationality into the self-completion form because we wish first to ascertain how people react generally to a question on these lines and secondly because we wish to try to distinguish in people's minds the difference between the concepts of nationality and ethnicity.

In the follow-up interview, therefore, we are confining ourselves to enquiring if people find it a difficult question to answer and if so, how they see the problem.

Consequently, if the informant says he or she had any difficulty whatever answering the nationality question, probe as fully as possible, but use only OPEN PROBES as in an opinion question.

Q3 When checking the ethnicity question (8), if the informant appears to you to be of a different race to what he or she has recorded on the form, do not query this if the answer is consistent with what has been recorded for other (related) members of the household. But it is advisable to make a note (at Q3) of the apparent conflict between the way the form has been completed and your own observations, although the discrepancy should be picked up by the coders from your answer to Q10.

If, however, there is any inconsistency between the way in which the ethnic or racial origins of related members of the household are described, this should be checked with the informant. For example, if one or both parents are shown as being of West Indian descent but their children are shown as being of European (White) descent. With cases like this, simply read out what has been recorded for each of the people concerned and ask if that is correct. If the informant says that it is correct and offers an explanation, or says that it is a mistake and tells you what it ought to be, then record this at Q3, but do not alter what the informant has written on the self-completion form. If the informant merely confirms that the information is correct, but offers no explanation, do not probe any further but make a note of what happened at Q3.

However, if the informant has written something that is undecipherable, inadequate or ambiguous in an "other race or ethnic origin" panel, this should be queried. For example, someone might use the term "Asian" in his description, which of course covers Indian etc and Chinese, as well as other groups. If this occurs, ask the informant if he would explain further.

Additionally, you should ask the informant about anything else on the centre and back pages of the form which is undecipherable, ambiguous or has been omitted.

Q6 If the informant has already explained why someone has been recorded as having dual nationality, ring DNA code 2 and enter in the box the question number where the explanation is to be found. But only do this if the previous note is a full and adequate answer to this question; otherwise Q6 must be asked.

Q7 Similarly here, only ring code 3 if the previous explanation for why someone has been shown as of mixed descent is a full answer.

If you think the reason someone has been shown as being of mixed descent is obvious from the other answers on the form ring the DNA 2 code. But if you think it might not be immediately obvious to the coder, please add a note in the "Explanation" panel beneath.

Q10 Try to base your coding at this question solely on your personal impressions - as the main purpose of this question is to provide us with an independent check on the information furnished by the informant. In other words, indicate what you would have guessed to be the person's racial or ethnic origins had you not had the benefit of seeing previously what he or she had written on the form.

AT THE END OF THE INTERVIEW REMEMBER TO GIVE OUT A PINK LEAFLET

WHEN YOU SEND THE DOCUMENT INTO THE OFFICE, PLACE THE FOLLOW-UP INTERVIEW SCHEDULE INSIDE THE SELF-COMPLETION FORM AND TAG THE TWO TOGETHER, PLEASE.

ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENTS

1. If you have any queries, please contact the following persons:

   (i) SAMPLING
   Eileen Goddard - on extension 2384/2385

   (ii) FIELD
   Norah Blackshaw or
   Sally Radford - on extension 2265 (reverse charge line)

   (iii) RESEARCH
   Ken Sillitoe - on extension 2334/2336

2. Field Dates: July 2 - 30.

3. Despatch of Work:

   Full and Partial Interviews: Tag interview and self-completion form together.

   Non-Response: Complete non-response form. Where a self-completion form was prepared tag this to the non-response form. (Try to ensure that ALL self-completion forms left with informants are collected, even if the householder subsequently refuses to complete it.)

   Multi-Household Addresses: It is not necessary to send all households at the same address together. Consequently as soon as the first household is completed it should be despatched.

4. Despatch Note:

   On the despatch note, you are asked to indicate for each serial number shown in the despatch how many households are situated at the same address. This will help monitor the degree of variability between quotas. If at a subsequent call, you discover that the information supplied concerning the number of households at the address was incorrect, please note this fact as well as the correct information.

5. Reports:

   This survey is very much an experimental one as regards the topic area, and consequently we would like some information from you about the way in which the survey was received by the public and as to how well the arrangements for leaving and collecting the forms went. Consequently we are asking some interviewers to complete reports on the survey and to attend an inquest. Unfortunately due to cost constraints we cannot ask everyone to attend the inquest. We are, therefore, trying to arrange for one interviewer who worked on each sample type to attend the inquest. Those being invited to attend will be sent a special invitation.

6. Study Time: 1½ hours.

7. Checking Time:

   Interviews: 10 minutes

   Non-Response: 10 minutes. (N.B. Non-Response forms on this survey will be analysed by Research in order to find out which kinds of informants refused and whether their reasons related to the content of the form. It will, therefore, be important for you to write up all non-response fully.)

SS 1074/2

Minority Groups Methodology Survey

A

Interviewer's Name

Authorisation No.

Serial No. h/h

(i) Date self-completion schedule DELIVERED → 76

(ii) Date of COLLECTION and INTERVIEW → 76

(iii) INFORMANT'S Person Number on self-completion schedule →

(iv) If informant was the person who filled-in the self-completion schedule

Yes ..	1
No ...	2

(A) If at least some attempt made to fill-in self-completion schedule but infmt REFUSED TO ANSWER ANY FURTHER QUESTIONS. Obtain as full an explanation as possible and record below:

Thank infmt and end interview here
BUT REMEMBER TO COMPLETE QUESTION 10

(B) If at least some attempt made to fill-in self-completion schedule and infmt agrees to answer further questions, then GO NOW TO QUESTION 1 overleaf →

C0

NOTE: IF THE INFORMANT WAS NOT THE PERSON WHO FILLED-IN THE SELF-COMPLETION SCHEDULE, ASK THE ALTERNATIVE FORM OF THE QUESTION IN BRACKETS

Q1 Did you find any of the questions difficult to answer? Yes .. 1 – Ask (a) and (b)

(Do you know if ..... found any of the questions difficult to answer?

No ... 2

DK ... 3

Other answer .. 4
(specify)

(a) IF YES

Which ones? RECORD QUESTION NUMBERS BELOW AND THEN ASK (b) IN RELATION TO EACH ONE MENTIONED

(b) In what way was ..... difficult to answer?

QUESTION No.	CAUSE OF DIFFICULTY

C1

NOTE: IF THE INFORMANT WAS NOT THE PERSON WHO FILLED-IN THE SELF-COMPLETION SCHEDULE, ASK THE ALTERNATIVE FORM OF THE QUESTION IN BRACKETS

Q2 ONLY TO BE ASKED IF ONE OR MORE MEMBERS OF THE HOUSEHOLD WERE BORN OUTSIDE THE UK

DNA (1) All members of households were born in the UK 1

DNA (2) Difficulty with nationality already described at Q1 2

We have found that especially if a person was born overseas, some people are not quite sure how to describe their nationality.

TO FORM-FILLER → "Did you have any difficulty describing the nationality of anyone in your household; or did you always find that question easy to answer?

IF INFMT NOT FORM-FILLER → (Do you know if ..... had any difficulty describing the nationality of anyone in your household; or did he/she always find that question easy to answer?)

Always easy to answer 1

Difficult (in any way) ... 2 → Ask (a)

Other answer (specify) ... 3

(a) IF DIFFICULT (IN ANY WAY)

In what way did you (he/she) find it difficult?

O (PROBE FULLY)

Person No.	Cause of difficulty

62

Q3 Now check through self-completion schedule and ask infmt about anything (else) which has been omitted or needs clarifying. Make a brief note below, giving the correct answer and the reason for the omission or ambiguity:

DNA Nothing (else) omitted or needing to be clarified X

Qn. No.	Person No.	Give CORRECT ANSWER	Give REASON for omission or ambiguity

63

Q4 **INFORMANT'S PLACE OF BIRTH**

Can you tell me the name of the town or city in ..... (infmt's country of birth) where you were born, or the nearest town or city?

Q5 **INFMT'S PARENTS' COUNTRY OF BIRTH**

DNA (FATHER'S country of birth already given on self-completion schedule)... X

(a) FATHER

Can you tell me what was your father's country of birth?

DNA (MOTHER'S country of birth already given on self-completion schedule)... X

(b) MOTHER

(and) In what country was your mother born?

Q6 **DUAL NATIONALITY**

[If more than one nationality is recorded for anyone in the household, ask question below:]

DNA (1) No-one of dual nationality in the household... 1

DNA (2) Explanation already given in answer to Q ☐.. 2

Can you explain why (the nationality of ..../your nationality) has been shown as both ..... and .....?

Person No.	EXPLANATION

C4

Q7 **MIXED DESCENT**

[If more than one ethnic origin box has been ticked for anyone in the household, and the explanation is not obvious from other information given on the form (eg the person's parents who are also living in the household are of different ethnic groups), ask question below:]

DNA (1) No-one shown as being of mixed descent in household 1

DNA (2) Explanation is obvious from form (eg parents of different origins). 2

DNA (3) Explanation already given in answer to Question ☐ 3

I see that ..... has/have been shown as being of both ..... and ..... descent. Could you please explain to me in what way ..... is/are of both ..... and ..... descent?

Person No.	EXPLANATION

C5

NOTE: IF THE INFORMANT WAS NOT THE PERSON WHO FILLED-IN THE SELF-COMPLETION SCHEDULE, ASK THE ALTERNATIVE FORM OF THE QUESTION IN BRACKETS

Q8 Were there any questions on the form which you did not like answering?

(Do you know if there were any questions on the form which ..... did not like answering?)

Yes ..	1	Ask (a) and (b)
No ...	2	Go to Q9
DK ...	3	Go to Q9
Other answer. (specify)	4	Go to Q9

(a) IF YES

Which ones? RECORD QUESTION NUMBERS BELOW AND THEN ASK (b) IN RELATION TO EACH ONE MENTIONED

(b) What were your (his/her) reasons for not liking the question about .....?

O

QUESTION NO	REASONS FOR DISLIKING QUESTION

Q9 From the last census, attempts were made to get figures about racial or ethnic origins from the answers to the question about where the parents of each member of the household were born.

On the form you have just filled in we asked directly for the race or ethnic origin of each person.

Which type of question do you personally find most acceptable .....

a question about your parents' country of birth	1	ask (a)
or a direct question about your racial or ethnic origins?	2	ask (a)
NEITHER type of question is acceptable	3	
BOTH types of question are equally acceptable	4	
OTHER ANSWER (specify)	5	

If coded 1, 2 or 3 above

(a) Why is that?

O

TO BE ANSWERED BY INTERVIEWER

Q10 Judging from the informant's appearance and speech would you say his/her racial/ethnic origins are .....

WHITE (European descent) ..	1
Asian/Oriental	2
West Indian/African	3
OTHER (specify)	4

PURPOSE OF THE SURVEY

As was explained on the cover page of the form you were asked to complete, this survey is an experiment in which we are testing out questions for possible use in the next Census.

The Government has to look after the employment and general living standards of all sections of the population. To help it do this, the OPCS collects statistical information through social surveys and the Census; and in order to find out about the circumstances of particular groups of people we have to ask for certain personal details. If we want to know about the living conditions of old age pensioners, for example, we have first to find out how old everyone is. Similarly, in order to collect information about the special difficulties faced by some of the ethnic and other minorities in Britain, we need to know everyone's racial or ethnic origins and their nationality.

Up to now the only way to distinguish some of these minority groups has been through parents' country of birth. But this often gives the wrong impression of a person's origins, because the country of birth of a person's parents may not be the country from which his or her ancestors originally came. There are many white people living in the United Kingdom who have a parent who was born, for example, in India, Singapore or Nigeria. In the same way, there are people of Indian descent whose parents were born in East Africa. In the future there will also be an increasing number of United Kingdom citizens whose parents were born here but whose ancestors originally came from places like India, Pakistan or the West Indies.

The only practical way to avoid these difficulties is to ask people directly about their ethnic origins and nationality. This has been the custom for many years in several other countries which have racially or ethnically diverse populations.

As in all our surveys, the names and addresses of people who help us will be held in strict confidence by OPCS and will not be passed on to any other Government Department, or to members of the public or press. Any information collected during surveys which is given to other Government Departments, is sent in such a form that no individual can be personally identified. Similarly, in published reports the identity of an individual is never revealed, either directly or by implication.

In all our surveys we rely on people's voluntary co-operation, which is essential if our work is to be successful. We hope that this leaflet shows you how the information we are collecting will be used and that no-one will suffer in any way at all from contributing to the survey.

Your co-operation is very much appreciated.

THE SOCIAL SURVEY DIVISION
Office of Population Censuses and Surveys
St Catherines House
10 Kingsway, London WC2B 6JP

(Tel: 01-242 0262 Ext 2334

(S1074/2)

B

OFFICE OF POPULATION CENSUSES AND SURVEYS

SOCIAL SURVEY DIVISION

To be entered by Interviewer:	Interviewer's Name	
Name		
Address	Authorisation Number	
.....		h/h
.....	Serial Number	

SPECIMEN

To the Head (or Acting Head) of the Household

The Social SurveyDivision of the OPCS is a government research organisation which does social and economic surveys on behalf of Government Departments and Royal Commissions.

The purpose of this present survey is to test various questions for possible introduction into the next Census. Up until now the questions usually asked in the Census have not enabled the Government to find out enough about the general living conditions and employment of the many ethnic and other minority groups that now live in Britain, and about the special difficulties they sometimes have to face. One of the main aims of this present survey is to see if we can remedy this by finding better ways of distinguishing these groups.

The survey is completely voluntary. But we would naturally like as many people as possible to help us with this experiment.

The information you give will of course be treated as CONFIDENTIAL. Under no circumstances will any information about named individuals be passed to any other Government Department or to any other authority or person.

We are leaving the form for you to complete by yourself. One of our staff interviewers will be calling to collect it on .....

We are very interested to know what people think about the questions we are asking on the form and so when our interviewer returns she will ask to speak to the person who completed it, to find out if they had any difficulties or have other comments to make about it. If you find you cannot (or do not want to) fill-in the form we should be most grateful if you would explain your reasons to our interviewer.

THANK YOU

Social Survey Division (OPCS)
St Catherines House
10 Kingsway
London WC2B 6JP

(Tele: 01-242 0262 Ext 2334)

ENTER IN THE TOP ROW THE NAMES OF ALL MEMBERS OF YOUR HOUSEHOLD WHO USUALLY LIVE AT THIS ADDRESS

NOTE: A household comprises **either** one person living alone **or** a group of persons (who may or may not be related) living at the same address, with common housekeeping.

	1st Person	2nd Person
1 NAME (in BLOCK CAPITALS please) Begin with the head of the household	Surname Forename(s)	Surname Forename(s)
2 RELATIONSHIP TO HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD Please tick the box which indicates the relationship of each person to the head of the household	1 ☐ Head of household	2 ☐ Husband or wife of head of household 3 ☐ Son or daughter of head of household 4 ☐ **Other** (Please write below) .....
3 SEX Please tick the appropriate box	1 ☐ Male 2 ☐ Female	1 ☐ Male 2 ☐ Female
4 MARITAL STATUS Please tick the appropriate box	1 ☐ Single 2 ☐ Married 3 ☐ Separated but not divorced 4 ☐ Divorced 5 ☐ Widowed	1 ☐ Single 2 ☐ Married 3 ☐ Separated but not divorced 4 ☐ Divorced 5 ☐ Widowed
5 DATE OF BIRTH	Day / Month / Year	Day / Month / Year
6 COUNTRY OF BIRTH Please tick the appropriate box	1 ☐ England 2 ☐ Wales 3 ☐ Scotland 4 ☐ Northern Ireland 5 ☐ **Elsewhere** (please write the present name of the country below)	1 ☐ England 2 ☐ Wales 3 ☐ Scotland 4 ☐ Northern Ireland 5 ☐ **Elsewhere** (please write the present name of the country below) .....
7 NATIONALITY Please tick the appropriate box	1 ☐ British 2 ☐ Any **other** nationality (please describe below)	1 ☐ British 2 ☐ Any **other** nationality (please describe below) ....

2 ☐ Husband or wife of head of household
3 ☐ Son or daughter of head of household
4 ☐ **Other** (Please write below)
.....

1 ☐ Male
2 ☐ Female

1 ☐ Single
2 ☐ Married
3 ☐ Separated but not divorced
4 ☐ Divorced
5 ☐ Widowed

Day	Month	Year

1 ☐ England
2 ☐ Wales
3 ☐ Scotland
4 ☐ Northern Ireland
5 ☐ **Elsewhere** (please write the present name of the country below)
.....

1 ☐ British
2 ☐ Any **other** nationality (please describe below)
.....
.....

2 ☐ Husband or wife of head of household
3 ☐ Son or daughter of head of household
4 ☐ **Other** (Please write below)
.....

1 ☐ Male
2 ☐ Female

1 ☐ Single
2 ☐ Married
3 ☐ Separated but not divorced
4 ☐ Divorced
5 ☐ Widowed

Day	Month	Year

1 ☐ England
2 ☐ Wales
3 ☐ Scotland
4 ☐ Northern Ireland
5 ☐ **Elsewhere** (please write the present name of the country below)
.....

1 ☐ British
2 ☐ Any **other** nationality (please describe below)
.....
.....

2 ☐ Husband or wife of head of household
3 ☐ Son or daughter of head of household
4 ☐ **Other** (Please write below)
.....

1 ☐ Male
2 ☐ Female

1 ☐ Single
2 ☐ Married
3 ☐ Separated but not divorced
4 ☐ Divorced
5 ☐ Widowed

Day	Month	Year

1 ☐ England
2 ☐ Wales
3 ☐ Scotland
4 ☐ Northern Ireland
5 ☐ **Elsewhere** (please write the present name of the country below)
.....

1 ☐ British
2 ☐ Any **other** nationality (please describe below)
.....
.....

2 ☐ Husband or wife of head of household
3 ☐ Son or daughter of head of household
4 ☐ **Other** (Please write below)
.....

1 ☐ Male
2 ☐ Female

1 ☐ Single
2 ☐ Married
3 ☐ Separated but not divorced
4 ☐ Divorced
5 ☐ Widowed

Day	Month	Year

1 ☐ England
2 ☐ Wales
3 ☐ Scotland
4 ☐ Northern Ireland
5 ☐ **Elsewhere** (please write the present name of the country below)
.....

1 ☐ British
2 ☐ Any **other** nationality (please describe below)
.....
.....

PLEASE TURN OVER ⟶

8 RACE or ETHNIC ORIGIN

Please tick one box only.

1 ☐ White (European descent)
2 ☐ West Indian
3 ☐ African
4 ☐ Arab
5 ☐ Chinese

If of: Indian Pakistani Bangladeshi or Sri Lankan descent → Please tick one box below:
6 ☐ Hindu
7 ☐ Sikh
8 ☐ Muslim
9 ☐ Other

10 ☐ MIXED DESCENT
11 ☐ Any **other** race or ethnic origin (describe below)

.....

1 ☐ White (European descent)
2 ☐ West Indian
3 ☐ African
4 ☐ Arab
5 ☐ Chinese

If of: Indian Pakistani Bangladeshi or Sri Lankan descent → Please tick one box below:
6 ☐ Hindu
7 ☐ Sikh
8 ☐ Muslim
9 ☐ Other

10 ☐ MIXED DESCENT
11 ☐ Any **other** race or ethnic origin (describe below)

.....

9 EMPLOYMENT **[TO BE ANSWERED ONLY FOR PERSONS AGED 16 YEARS AND OVER]**

Please tick **all** the boxes which describe the person's situation **last week**

Tick the first box if the person did any work for **pay or profit** last week, including:

(a) part-time work, even if only for a few hours

(b) casual or temporary work

(c) work on a person's own account

(d) work in a family business

Tick the first box if the person was on strike, on paid holiday or temporarily laid off.

1 ☐ In a job at any time last week
2 ☐ Temporarily off work due to sickness or injury
3 ☐ Waiting to take up a job already accepted
4 ☐ Seeking work
5 ☐ Prevented by temporary sickness from seeking work
6 ☐ Permanently sick or disabled
7 ☐ Housewife
8 ☐ Wholly retired
9 ☐ At school or full-time student
0 ☐ **Other** (please describe below)

.....

.....72.....

1 ☐ In a job at any time last week
2 ☐ Temporarily off work due to sickness or injury
3 ☐ Waiting to take up a job already accepted
4 ☐ Seeking work
5 ☐ Prevented by temporary sickness from seeking work
6 ☐ Permanently sick or disabled
7 ☐ Housewife
8 ☐ Wholly retired
9 ☐ At school or full-time student
0 ☐ **Other** (please describe below)

.....

1 ☐ White (European descent)
2 ☐ West Indian
3 ☐ African
4 ☐ Arab
5 ☐ Chinese

If of: Indian, Pakistani, Bangladeshi or Sri Lankan descent → Please tick one box below:
6 ☐ Hindu
7 ☐ Sikh
8 ☐ Muslim
9 ☐ Other

10 ☐ MIXED DESCENT
11 ☐ Any **other** race or ethnic origin (describe below)

.....

1 ☐ In a job at any time last week
2 ☐ Temporarily off work due to sickness or injury
3 ☐ Waiting to take up a job already accepted
4 ☐ Seeking work
5 ☐ Prevented by temporary sickness from seeking work
6 ☐ Permanently sick or disabled
7 ☐ Housewife
8 ☐ Wholly retired
9 ☐ At school or full-time student
0 ☐ **Other** (please describe below)

.....

1 ☐ White (European descent)
2 ☐ West Indian
3 ☐ African
4 ☐ Arab
5 ☐ Chinese

If of: Indian, Pakistani, Bangladeshi or Sri Lankan descent → Please tick one box below:
6 ☐ Hindu
7 ☐ Sikh
8 ☐ Muslim
9 ☐ Other

10 ☐ MIXED DESCENT
11 ☐ Any **other** race or ethnic origin (describe below)

.....

1 ☐ In a job at any time last week
2 ☐ Temporarily off work due to sickness or injury
3 ☐ Waiting to take up a job already accepted
4 ☐ Seeking work
5 ☐ Prevented by temporary sickness from seeking work
6 ☐ Permanently sick or disabled
7 ☐ Housewife
8 ☐ Wholly retired
9 ☐ At school or full-time student
0 ☐ **Other** (please describe below)

.....

1 ☐ White (European descent)
2 ☐ West Indian
3 ☐ African
4 ☐ Arab
5 ☐ Chinese

If of: Indian, Pakistani, Bangladeshi or Sri Lankan descent → Please tick one box below:
6 ☐ Hindu
7 ☐ Sikh
8 ☐ Muslim
9 ☐ Other

10 ☐ MIXED DESCENT
11 ☐ Any **other** race or ethnic origin (describe below)

.....

1 ☐ In a job at any time last week
2 ☐ Temporarily off work due to sickness or injury
3 ☐ Waiting to take up a job already accepted
4 ☐ Seeking work
5 ☐ Prevented by temporary sickness from seeking work
6 ☐ Permanently sick or disabled
7 ☐ Housewife
8 ☐ Wholly retired
9 ☐ At school or full-time student
0 ☐ Other (please describe below)

.....

1 ☐ White (European descent)
2 ☐ West Indian
3 ☐ African
4 ☐ Arab
5 ☐ Chinese

If of: Indian, Pakistani, Bangladeshi or Sri Lankan descent → Please tick one box below:
6 ☐ Hindu
7 ☐ Sikh
8 ☐ Muslim
9 ☐ Other

10 ☐ MIXED DESCENT
11 ☐ Any **other** race or ethnic origin (describe below)

.....

1 ☐ In a job at any time last week
2 ☐ Temporarily off work due to sickness or injury
3 ☐ Waiting to take up a job already accepted
4 ☐ Seeking work
5 ☐ Prevented by temporary sickness from seeking work
6 ☐ Permanently sick or disabled
7 ☐ Housewife
8 ☐ Wholly retired
9 ☐ At school or full-time student
0 ☐ **Other** (please describe below)

.....

SPECIMEN

PLEASE TURN OVER →

10 EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATIONS (TO BE ANSWERED ONLY FOR PERSONS AGED 16 YEARS AND OVER)

If NONE of the qualifications listed below has been obtained tick box 1 If one or more has been obtained please tick the appropriate boxes:	1 ☐ NONE	1 ☐ NONE
Box 2 = Certificate of Secondary Education (CSE), Grades 2 - 5	2 ☐ CSE (Grades 2 - 5)	2 ☐ CSE (Grade 2 - 5)
Box 3 = GCE 'O' level or CSE Grade 1 or School Certificate or Matriculation or Scottish Certificate of Education or Scottish Leaving Certificate	3 ☐ 'O' level, etc.	3 ☐ 'O' level, etc.
Box 4 = GCE 'A' level or Higher School Certificate (HSC) or Higher Grade of Scottish Certificate of Education or Higher Grade of Scottish Leaving Certificate	4 ☐ 'A' level, etc.	4 ☐ 'A' level, etc.
Box 5 = Ordinary National Certificate (ONC) or Ordinary National Diploma (OND)	5 ☐ ONC, OND	5 ☐ ONC, OND
Box 6 = Any other qualification similar to those listed above	6 ☐ **OTHER** (describe below)	6 ☐ **OTHER** (describe below)
	.....	.....
	.....	.....
If the person obtained other qualifications, **after age 18,** such as: Degrees, diplomas, HNC, HND, Nursing or Teaching Qualifications, Graduate or Corporate membership of professional institutions, or other education, professional and vocational qualifications ...	I II III IV	I II III IV
please write for each qualification: I The TITLE II The MAJOR SUBJECT OR SUBJECTS III The AWARDING INSTITUTE IV The YEAR OBTAINED	I II III IV	I II III IV
Enter all qualifications even if they are not relevant to the person's present job or if the person is not working. If more than three please enter in a spare column and link with an arrow.	I II III IV	I II III IV

NOTE: If there are more than 6 persons in the household, tell the interviewer and she will give you an extra form.

3rd Person	4th Person	5th Person	6th Person
Surname	Surname	Surname	Surname
Forename(s)	Forename(s)	Forename(s)	Forename(s)
1 ☐ NONE	1 ☐ NONE	1 ☐ NONE	1 ☐ NONE
2 ☐ CSE (Grades 2 - 5)	2 ☐ CSE (Grade 2 - 5)	2 ☐ CSE (Grades 2 - 5)	2 ☐ CSE (Grade 2 - 5)
3 ☐ 'O' level, etc.	3 ☐ 'O' level, etc.	3 ☐ 'O' level, etc.	3 ☐ 'O' level, etc.
4 ☐ 'A' level, etc.	4 ☐ 'A' level, etc.	4 ☐ 'A' level, etc.	4 ☐ 'A' level, etc.
5 ☐ ONC, OND	5 ☐ ONC, OND	5 ☐ ONC, OND	5 ☐ ONC, OND
6 ☐ **OTHER** (describe below)	6 ☐ **OTHER** (describe below)	6 ☐ **OTHER** (describe below)	6 ☐ **OTHER** (describe below)
I	I	I	I
II	II	II	II
III	III	III	III
IV	IV	IV	IV
I	I	I	I
II	II	II	II
III	III	III	III
IV	IV	IV	IV
I	I	I	I
II	II	II	II
III	III	III	III
IV	IV	IV	IV

PLEASE TURN OVER ⟶

H1 LANGUAGES

Please indicate by ticking the appropriate box(es) below, **the language or languages normally used** within this household:

1 ☐ English
2 ☐ Welsh
3 ☐ Gaelic
4 ☐ Greek
5 ☐ Turkish
6 ☐ Hindi
7 ☐ Urdu
8 ☐ Punjabi
9 ☐ Gujarati
10 ☐ Bengali
11 ☐ Any **other language** (please write below)

.....

H2 HOUSEHOLD TENURE

Please tick the way in which you and your household occupy your accommodation.

As an owner occupier (including purchase by mortgage) or on a lease **originally** granted for over 21 years ..... ☐ 1

Rented from a Council or New Town ..... ☐ 2

Rented from a private landlord or Company or Housing Association — FURNISHED ..... ☐ 3; UNFURNISHED ..... ☐ 4

With a job, shop, farm or other business (rented or rent free) — FURNISHED ..... ☐ 5; UNFURNISHED ..... ☐ 6

In some other way ..... ☐ 7
Please write details (including whether furnished or unfurnished) .....

H3 AMENITIES

Has your household the use of the following amenities on these premises?

a. **A cooker or cooking stove** with an oven
1 ☐ YES - for use only by this household
2 ☐ YES - for use also by another household
3 ☐ NO

b. A **kitchen sink** permanently connected to a water supply and a waste pipe
1 ☐ YES - for use only by this household
2 ☐ YES - for use also by another household
3 ☐ NO

c. A **fixed bath or shower** permanently connected to a water supply and a waste pipe
1 ☐ YES - for use only by this household
2 ☐ YES - for use also by another household
3 ☐ NO

d. A **hot water** supply (to a washbasin, or kitchen sink, or bath or shower) from a heating appliance or boiler which is connected to a piped water supply
1 ☐ YES - for use only by this household
2 ☐ YES - for use also by another household
3 ☐ NO

e. A **flush toilet** (W.C.) with entrance **inside** the building
1 ☐ YES - for use only by this household
2 ☐ YES - for use also by another household
3 ☐ NO

f. A **flush toilet** (W.C.) with entrance **outside** the building
1 ☐ YES - for use only by this household
2 ☐ YES - for use also by another household
3 ☐ NO

H4 ACCOMMODATION

(please answer part (a) and part (b))

(a) ROOMS

Please count the rooms in your household's accommodation and write in the number below. Do not count:

Kitchens under 6ft wide
Bathrooms and toilets
Sculleries not used for cooking
Closets, pantries and storerooms
Landings, halls, lobbies or recesses
Offices or shops used solely for business purposes

Number of rooms .....

A large room divided by a sliding or fixed partition should be counted as two rooms.
A room divided by curtains or portable screens should be counted as one room.

(b) SHARING

Do you share any of the rooms you have counted above with any other household?

1 ☐ YES 2 ☐ NO

In moving between the rooms you have counted above do you have to share with any other household the use of a hall, passage, landing or staircase?

1 ☐ YES 2 ☐ NO

H5 CARS AND VANS

How many cars and vans are normally available for use by you or members of your household (other than visitors)?
If none write 'NONE'.

Number of cars and vans .....

INCLUDE any provided by employers if normally available for use by you or members of your household but EXCLUDE vans used solely for the carriage of goods.

W344B OPCS 6/76

A

OFFICE OF POPULATION CENSUSES AND SURVEYS

SOCIAL SURVEY DIVISION

To be entered by Interviewer:	Interviewer's Name	
Name		
Address	Authorisation Number	
.....		h/h
.....	Serial Number	

SPECIMEN

To the Head (or Acting Head) of the Household

The Social SurveyDivision of the OPCS is a government research organisation which does social and economic surveys on behalf of Government Departments and Royal Commissions.

The purpose of this present survey is to test various questions for possible introduction into the next Census. Up until now the questions usually asked in the Census have not enabled the Government to find out enough about the general living conditions and employment of the many ethnic and other minority groups that now live in Britain, and about the special difficulties they sometimes have to face. One of the main aims of this present survey is to see if we can remedy this by finding better ways of distinguishing these groups.

The survey is completely voluntary. But we would naturally like as many people as possible to help us with this experiment.

The information you give will of course be treated as CONFIDENTIAL. Under no circumstances will any information about named individuals be passed to any other Government Department or to any other authority or person.

We are leaving the form for you to complete by yourself. One of our staff interviewers will be calling to collect it on .....

We are very interested to know what people think about the questions we are asking on the form and so when our interviewer returns she will ask to speak to the person who completed it, to find out if they had any difficulties or have other comments to make about it. If you find you cannot (or do not want to) fill-in the form we should be most grateful if you would explain your reasons to our interviewer.

THANK YOU

Social Survey Division (OPCS)
St Catherines House
10 Kingsway
London WC2B 6JP

(Tele: 01-242 0262 Ext 2334)

ENTER IN THE TOP ROW THE NAMES OF ALL MEMBERS OF YOUR HOUSEHOLD WHO USUALLY LIVE AT THIS ADDRESS

NOTE: A household comprises **either** one person living alone **or** a group of persons (who may or may not be related) living at the same address, with common housekeeping.

	1st Person	2nd Person
1 **NAME** (in BLOCK CAPITALS) please Begin with the head of the household	Surname Forename(s)	Surname Forename(s)
2 **RELATIONSHIP TO HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD** Please tick the box which indicates the relationship of each person to the head of the household	1 ☐ Head of household	2 ☐ Husband or wife of head of household 3 ☐ Son or daughter of head of household 4 ☐ **Other** (please write below) .....
3 **SEX** Please tick the appropriate box	1 ☐ Male 2 ☐ Female	1 ☐ Male 2 ☐ Female
4 **MARITAL STATUS** Please tick the appropriate box	1 ☐ Single 2 ☐ Married 3 ☐ Separated but not divorced 4 ☐ Divorced 5 ☐ Widowed	1 ☐ Single 2 ☐ Married 3 ☐ Separated but not divorced 4 ☐ Divorced 5 ☐ Widowed
5 **DATE OF BIRTH**	Day / Month / Year	Day / Month / Year
6 **COUNTRY OF BIRTH** If the person was born in England, Wales, Scotland or Northern Ireland, please tick the appropriate box. If the person was born elsewhere, tick 'Elsewhere' and write, in the space provided, the present name of the country in which the birthplace is now situated.	1 ☐ England 2 ☐ Wales 3 ☐ Scotland 4 ☐ Northern Ireland 5 ☐ **Elsewhere** (please write the present name of the country below)	1 ☐ England 2 ☐ Wales 3 ☐ Scotland 4 ☐ Northern Ireland 5 ☐ **Elsewhere** (please write the present name of the country below) .....
7 **NATIONALITY** If the person has DUAL NATIONALITY please tick each box that applies.	1 ☐ Citizen of the United Kingdom of England, Wales Scotland and Northern Ireland 2 ☐ Any **other** nationality (please describe below)	1 ☐ Citizen of the United Kingdom of England, Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland 2 ☐ Any **other** nationality (please describe below) .....

2 ☐ Husband or wife of head of household
3 ☐ Son or daughter of head of household
4 ☐ **Other** (please write below)

.....

1 ☐ Male
2 ☐ Female

1 ☐ Single
2 ☐ Married
3 ☐ Separated but not divorced
4 ☐ Divorced
5 ☐ Widowed

Day	Month	Year

1 ☐ England
2 ☐ Wales
3 ☐ Scotland
4 ☐ Northern Ireland
5 ☐ **Elsewhere** (please write the present name of the country below)

.....

1 ☐ Citizen of the United Kingdom of England, Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland
2 ☐ Any **other** nationality (please describe below)

.....

2 ☐ Husband or wife of head of household
3 ☐ Son or daughter of head of household
4 ☐ **Other** (please write below)

.....

1 ☐ Male
2 ☐ Female

1 ☐ Single
2 ☐ Married
3 ☐ Separated but not divorced
4 ☐ Divorced
5 ☐ Widowed

Day	Month	Year

1 ☐ England
2 ☐ Wales
3 ☐ Scotland
4 ☐ Northern Ireland
5 ☐ **Elsewhere** (please write the present name of the country below)

.....

1 ☐ Citizen of the United Kingdom of England, Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland
2 ☐ Any **other** nationality (please describe below)

.....

2 ☐ Husband or wife of head of household
3 ☐ Son or daughter of head of household
4 ☐ **Other** (please write below)

.....

1 ☐ Male
2 ☐ Female

1 ☐ Single
2 ☐ Married
3 ☐ Separated but not divorced
4 ☐ Divorced
5 ☐ Widowed

Day	Month	Year

1 ☐ England
2 ☐ Wales
3 ☐ Scotland
4 ☐ Northern Ireland
5 ☐ **Elsewhere** (please write the present name of the country below)

.....

1 ☐ Citizen of the United Kingdom of England, Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland
2 ☐ Any **other** nationality (please describe below)

.....

2 ☐ Husband or wife of head of household
3 ☐ Son or daughter of head of household
4 ☐ **Other** (please write below)

.....

1 ☐ Male
2 ☐ Female

1 ☐ Single
2 ☐ Married
3 ☐ Separated but not divorced
4 ☐ Divorced
5 ☐ Widowed

Day	Month	Year

1 ☐ England
2 ☐ Wales
3 ☐ Scotland
4 ☐ Northern Ireland
5 ☐ **Elsewhere** (please write the present name of the country below)

.....

1 ☐ Citizen of the United Kingdom of England, Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland
2 ☐ Any **other** nationality (please describe below)

.....

8 RACE or ETHNIC ORIGIN

Please tick the appropriate box

If of MIXED DESCENT please tick **all** the boxes that apply

1 ☐ White (European descent)	1 ☐ White (European descent)
2 ☐ West Indian	2 ☐ West Indian
3 ☐ Indian	3 ☐ Indian
4 ☐ Pakistani	4 ☐ Pakistani
5 ☐ Bangladeshi	5 ☐ Bangladeshi
6 ☐ African	6 ☐ African
7 ☐ Arab	7 ☐ Arab
8 ☐ Chinese	8 ☐ Chinese
9 ☐ Any **other** race or ethnic origin (describe below)	9 ☐ Any **other** race or ethnic origin (describe below)
.....	.....
.....	.....
.....	.....

9 EMPLOYMENT **[TO BE ANSWERED ONLY FOR PERSONS AGED 16 YEARS AND OVER]**

Please tick **all** the boxes which describe the person's situation **last week**

Tick the first box if the person did any work for **pay or profit** last week, including:

a) part-time work, even if only for a few hours

b) casual or temporary work

c) work on a person's own account

d) work in a family business

Tick the first box if the person was on strike, on paid holiday or temporarily laid off.

1 ☐ In a job at any time last week	1 ☐ In a job at any time last week
2 ☐ Temporarily off work due to sickness or injury	2 ☐ Temporarily off work due to sickness or injury
3 ☐ Waiting to take up a job already accepted	3 ☐ Waiting to take up a job already accepted
4 ☐ Seeking work	4 ☐ Seeking work
5 ☐ Prevented by temporary sickness from seeking work	5 ☐ Prevented by temporary sickness from seeking work
6 ☐ Permanently sick or disabled	6 ☐ Permanently sick or disabled
7 ☐ Housewife	7 ☐ Housewife
8 ☐ Wholly retired	8 ☐ Wholly retired
9 ☐ At school or full-time student	9 ☐ At school or full-time student
0 ☐ Other (please describe below)	0 ☐ Other (please describe below)
.....	.....
.....	.....
.....	.....

1 ☐ White(European descent) 2 ☐ West Indian 3 ☐ Indian 4 ☐ Pakistani 5 ☐ Bangladeshi 6 ☐ African 7 ☐ Arab 8 ☐ Chinese 9 ☐ Any **other** race or ethnic origin (describe below)	1 ☐ White(European descent) 2 ☐ West Indian 3 ☐ Indian 4 ☐ Pakistani 5 ☐ Bangladeshi 6 ☐ African 7 ☐ Arab 8 ☐ Chinese 9 ☐ Any **other** race or ethnic origin (describe below)	1 ☐ White(European descent) 2 ☐ West Indian 3 ☐ Indian 4 ☐ Pakistani 5 ☐ Bangladeshi 6 ☐ African 7 ☐ Arab 8 ☐ Chinese 9 ☐ Any **other** race or ethnic origin (describe below)	1 ☐ White(European descent) 2 ☐ West Indian 3 ☐ Indian 4 ☐ Pakistani 5 ☐ Bangladeshi 6 ☐ African 7 ☐ Arab 8 ☐ Chinese 9 ☐ Any **other** race or ethnic origin (describe below)
1 ☐ In a job at any time last week 2 ☐ Temporarily off work due to sickness or injury 3 ☐ Waiting to take up a job already accepted 4 ☐ Seeking work 5 ☐ Prevented by temporary sickness from seeking work 6 ☐ Permanently sick or disabled 7 ☐ Housewife 8 ☐ Wholly retired 9 ☐ At school or full-time student 0 ☐ Other (please describe below)	1 ☐ In a job at any time last week 2 ☐ Temporarily off work due to sickness or injury 3 ☐ Waiting to take up a job already accepted 4 ☐ Seeking work 5 ☐ Prevented by temporary sickness from seeking work 6 ☐ Permanently sick or disabled 7 ☐ Housewife 8 ☐ Wholly retired 9 ☐ At school or full-time student 0 ☐ Other (please describe below)	1 ☐ In a job at any time last week 2 ☐ Temporarily off work due to sickness or injury 3 ☐ Waiting to take up a job already accepted 4 ☐ Seeking work 5 ☐ Prevented by temporary sickness from seeking work 6 ☐ Permanently sick or disabled 7 ☐ Housewife 8 ☐ Wholly retired 9 ☐ At school or full-time student 0 ☐ Other (please describe below)	1 ☐ In a job at any time last week 2 ☐ Temporarily off work due to sickness or injury 3 ☐ Waiting to take up a job already accepted 4 ☐ Seeking work 5 ☐ Prevented by temporary sickness from seeking work 6 ☐ Permanently sick or disabled 7 ☐ Housewife 8 ☐ Wholly retired 9 ☐ At school or full-time student 0 ☐ Other (please describe below)

PLEASE TURN OVER

10 EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATIONS [TO BE ANSWERED ONLY FOR PERSONS AGED 16 YEARS AND OVER]

If none of the qualifications listed below has been obtained tick box 1

If one or more have been obtained please tick the appropriate box(es):

	1 ☐ NONE	1 ☐ NONE
Box 2 = Certificate of Secondary Education [CSE], Grades 2-5	2 ☐ CSE (Grades 2-5	2 ☐ CSE (Grades 2-5
Box 3 = GCE 'O' level or CSE grade 1 or School Certificate or Matriculation or Scottish Certificate of Education or Scottish Leaving Certificate	3 ☐ 'O' level, etc	3 ☐ 'O' level, etc
Box 4 = GCE 'A' level or Higher School Certificate [HSC] or Higher Grade of Scottish Certificate of Education or Higher Grade of Scottish Leaving Certificate	4 ☐ 'A' level, etc	4 ☐ 'A' level, etc
Box 5 = Ordinary National Certificate [ONC] or Ordinary National Diploma [OND]	5 ☐ ONC, OND	5 ☐ ONC, OND
Box 6 = Higher National Certificate [HNC] or Higher National Diploma [HND]	6 ☐ HNC, HND	6 ☐ HNC, HND
Box 7 = Nursing Qualifications	7 ☐ Nursing Qualifications	7 ☐ Nursing Qualifications
Box 8 = Teaching Qualifications	8 ☐ Teaching Qualifications	8 ☐ Teaching Qualifications
Box 9 = University Degrees [including CNAA degrees] and professional qualifications of equivalent standard	9 ☐ Degrees, etc.	9 ☐ Degrees, etc.
Box 10 = Any other educational or professional qualifications not listed above	10 ☐ **Other** qualifications (please describe below)	10 ☐ **Other** qualifications (please describe below) ....

SPECIMEN

3rd Person	4th Person	5th Person	6th Person
Surname	Surname	Surname	Surname
Forename(s)	Forename(s)	Forename(s)	Forename(s)
1 ☐ NONE	1 ☐ NONE	1 ☐ NONE	1 ☐ NONE
2 ☐ CSE (Grades 2-5	2 ☐ CSE (Grades 2-5	2 ☐ CSE (Grades 2-5	2 ☐ CSE (Grades 2-5
3 ☐ 'O' level, etc	3 ☐ 'O' level, etc	3 ☐ 'O' level, etc	3 ☐ 'O' level, etc
4 ☐ 'A' level, etc	4 ☐ 'A' level, etc	4 ☐ 'A' level, etc	4 ☐ 'A' level, etc
5 ☐ ONC, OND	5 ☐ ONC, OND	5 ☐ ONC, OND	5 ☐ ONC, OND
6 ☐ HNC, HND	6 ☐ HNC, HND	6 ☐ HNC, HND	6 ☐ HNC, HND
7 ☐ Nursing Qualifications	7 ☐ Nursing Qualifications	7 ☐ Nursing Qualifications	7 ☐ Nursing Qualifications
8 ☐ Teaching Qualifications	8 ☐ Teaching Qualifications	8 ☐ Teaching Qualifications	8 ☐ Teaching Qualifications
9 ☐ Degrees, etc.	9 ☐ Degrees, etc.	9 ☐ Degrees, etc.	9 ☐ Degrees, etc.
10 ☐ **Other** qualifications (please describe below)	10 ☐ **Other** qualifications (please describe below)	10 ☐ **Other** qualifications (please describe below)	10 ☐ **Other** qualifications (please describe below)

PLEASE TURN OVER →

H1 LANGUAGES

Please indicate by ticking the appropriate box(es) below, **the language or languages normally used** within this household:

1 ☐ English
2 ☐ Welsh
3 ☐ Gaelic
4 ☐ Greek
5 ☐ Turkish
6 ☐ Hindi
7 ☐ Urdu
8 ☐ Punjabi
9 ☐ Gujarati
10 ☐ Bengali
11 ☐ Any **other language** (please write below)

.....

H2 HOUSEHOLD TENURE

Please tick the way in which you and your household occupy your accommodation

As an owner occupier (including purchase by mortgage) or on a lease **originally** granted for over 21 years ..... ☐ 1

Rented from a Council or New Town ..... ☐ 2

Rented from a private landlord or Company or Housing Association — FURNISHED ..... ☐ 3
UNFURNISHED ..... ☐ 4

With a job, shop, farm or other business (rented or rent free) — FURNISHED ..... ☐ 5
UNFURNISHED ..... ☐ 6

In some other way ..... ☐ 7
Please write details (including whether furnished or unfurnished)

H3 AMENITIES

Has your household the use of the following amenities of these premises?

a. **A cooker or cooking stove** with an oven — 1 ☐ YES - for use only by this household; 2 ☐ YES - for use also by another household; 3 ☐ NO

b. **A kitchen sink** permanently connected to a water supply and a waste pipe — 1 ☐ YES - for use only by this household; 2 ☐ YES - for use also by another household; 3 ☐ NO

c. **A fixed bath or shower** permanently connected to a water supply and a waste pipe — 1 ☐ YES - for use only by this household; 2 ☐ YES - for use also by another household; 3 ☐ NO

d. **A hot water** supply (to a washbasin, or kitchen sink, or bath or shower) from a heating appliance or boiler which is connected to a piped water supply — 1 ☐ YES - for use only by this household; 2 ☐ YES - for use also by another household; 3 ☐ NO

e. **A flush toilet** (W.C.) with entrance **inside** the building — 1 ☐ YES - for use only by this household; 2 ☐ YES - for use also by another household; 3 ☐ NO

f. **A flush toilet** (W.C.) with entrance **outside** the building — 1 ☐ YES - for use only by this household; 2 ☐ YES - for use also by another household; 3 ☐ NO

H4 ACCOMMODATION

(please answer part (a) and part (b))

(a) ROOMS

Please count the rooms in your household's accommodation and write in the number below. Do not count:

Kitchens under 6ft wide
Bathrooms and toilets
Sculleries not used for cooking
Closets, pantries and storerooms
Landings, halls, lobbies or recesses
Offices or shops used solely for business purposes

Number of rooms .....

A large room divided by a sliding or fixed partition should be counted as two rooms.
A room divided by curtains or portable screens should be counted as one room.

(b) SHARING

Do you share any of the rooms you have counted above with any other household?

1 ☐ YES 2 ☐ NO

In moving between the rooms you have counted above do you have to share with any other household the use of a hall, passage, landing or staircase?

1 ☐ YES 2 ☐ NO

H5 CARS AND VANS

How many cars and vans are normally available for use by you or members of your household (other than visitors)?
If none write 'NONE'.

Number of cars and vans .....

INCLUDE any provided by employers if normally available for use by you or members of your household but EXCLUDE vans used solely for the carriage of goods.